Social Studies In-Service Evaluation

Planning Services

Alberta
EDUCATION

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

April, 1983

TO THE READER:

The Social Studies In-Service project (1981-32) provided opportunities for teachers to become familiar with the revised curriculum on a province-wide scale. The report which accompanies this letter presents the findings of an evaluation study carried out by Evaluation Consultants Limited under contract to Alberta Education relative to the project.

In the interests of economy of space and production costs, no copies of the various instruments used in assessing the Social Studies In-Service project have been included in the report. However, individual copies of any of the questionnaires will be supplied upon request.

We regret the considerable delay that has occurred in completion of the report - a delay which has been frustrating not only to many of the potential readers, but to those responsible for processing and disseminating the final product as well. We hope that you will find it to be useful and interesting, nevertheless.

Yours sincerely,

H.I. Hastings

H.I. Hastings
Director
Planning Services

ALBERTA EDUCATION SOCIAL STUDIES IN-SERVICE PROJECT: EXTERNAL EVALUATION

by

D.A. MacKay and M. Doherty

Under Contract to
Alberta Education
Edmonton, Alberta

September, 1982

83-8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The external evaluators wish to acknowledge the assistance of a number of individuals and groups. The Evaluation Steering Committee consisting of Bill Brownlee, Frank Crowther, Martin Goerzen, Felicia Melnyk, Fred Schreiber and Harry Sherk provided important advice and support throughout the project. The school superintendents and social studies supervisors as well as consultants in the Regional Offices of Alberta Education were of great assistance to us. The resource teachers played a key role in providing data and making our work enjoyable. The various individuals who responded to our questionnaires or who permitted us to interview them were indeed quite generous. Collection and analysis of the data were accomplished with the help of: Gail Barrington, Colleen Cooper, Frank Peters, Barbara Sykes and Ken Ward. Major work on the preparation of the first draft of the final report was done by Colleen Cooper. Chuck Humphrey provided assistance with computer analysis of the data, and the typing of the final report was efficiently done by Donnic Word Processing.

M. Doherty
D.A. MacKay

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and Overview

This evaluation study was commissioned by Alberta Education in July of 1981. It was designed to determine the effects of a province-wide in-service project for social studies teachers which had as its objectives:

1. For Alberta Teachers
   (a) to ensure that all social studies teachers in Alberta have a working understanding of the characteristics and requirements of the 1981 social studies curriculum;
   (b) to provide all social studies teachers in Alberta with opportunities to broaden their repertoire of instructional strategies for social studies.
2. For Alberta Social Studies
   (a) to ensure that the 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum, which has been the subject of considerable public and professional interest, is given a fair chance for successful implementation;
   (b) to provide a means for heightened professional and public dialogue about issues pertaining to social studies philosophy and methodology in Alberta.
3. For Curriculum Implementation in Alberta
   - to test the viability of a peer-based consultative approach to curriculum implementation in Alberta schools.

To carry out the in-service project 125 resource teachers were employed in jurisdictions across the province. The resource teachers served in a consultative role for teachers of social studies at all grade levels. Peer-based consulting was identified as a major feature of the design.

For the evaluation study, the following data sources were used:

A. Questionnaires (See Appendix A)
   1. Classroom Teacher Questionnaire
   2. Resource Teacher Pre-Questionnaire
   3. Classroom Teacher Questionnaire B

4. Classroom Teacher Survey
5. Resource Teacher Questionnaire
6. Case Study Questionnaire
7. Stakeholder Questionnaire

B. Interviews
1. Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule (Pre)
2. Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule (Post)
3. Interview Schedule for Resource Teachers
4. Stakeholder Interview Schedule

C. Workshop Observation Record

D. Document Analyses
1. Content Analysis Record of Log Books
2. Analysis of Other Project Documents

Conclusions

A number of conclusions were drawn by the external evaluators. These are presented in two sections: (1) conclusions about the evaluation questions, and (2) conclusions about the project objectives.

Conclusions about the Evaluation Questions

In Section 1.0 of this report seven evaluation questions were identified. Conclusions with respect to these questions are provided below.

Q.1. What effect does the in-service project have upon the knowledge of participating teachers?

Based on the results of pre- and post-test data, the classroom teacher survey, the teachers' pre- and post-interviews, the estimates of the resource teachers and the stakeholders, the conclusion is that:

1. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT HAD A VERY DEFINITE POSITIVE EFFECT UPON THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PARTICIPATING TEACHERS.

Q.2. What effect does the in-service project have upon the attitude of participating teachers?

Based on the same findings used to draw the first conclusion (above) the evaluators conclude that:

2. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT HAD A VERY DEFINITE POSITIVE EFFECT UPON THE ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS.

Q.3. What models for in-service were used?

The resource teacher log books, interviews with resource teachers and stakeholders, the case studies and the workshop observation records indicate that although there were many interesting local arrangements, no definite "models" in any significant sense of that word were employed. Therefore, on this evaluation question the conclusion is that:

3. WHILE INTERESTING VARIATIONS IN SOME ASPECTS OF LOCAL OR REGIONAL OPERATIONS WERE FOUND, THE DIFFERENCES WERE NOT SUBSTANTIAL ENOUGH TO SUGGEST THAT CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE "MODELS" HAD BEEN USED.

Q.4. Which "models" were most effective?

Given the conclusion regarding question 3 (above), the conclusion here is that:

4. NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE WAS AVAILABLE TO ENABLE THE EVALUATORS TO DRAW A CONCLUSION ON THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION.

Q.5. What side effects did the project have?

All of the data sources combined to indicate highly positive side effects upon resource teachers and participating teachers. There were some neutral and/or negative aspects mentioned as well. The negative aspects that were most frequently mentioned in the data were: insufficient lead-time for the project, insufficient time for the project, no follow-up activities for the project, inadequate training of resource teachers, unavailability of project resource materials, disruption of classroom learning and the cost of the project. The conclusion, therefore, is that:

5. THE PROJECT HAD A LARGE NUMBER OF SIDE EFFECTS. THESE WERE MAINLY POSITIVE; BUT THERE WERE SOME NEGATIVE ASPECTS AS WELL.

Q.6. How well was the process of planned dissemination carried out?

The data show clearly that the project was implemented and carried through to a successful conclusion even though the time-line for planning and the

early stages of implementation was quite short. In the opinion of the evaluators, the apparent willingness of Alberta Education to permit (or even encourage) local variations within the general guidelines was mainly positive in its effects. However, there was no evidence in our data that the notion of "models" received any more than fleeting consideration during the planning of the project. It seemed that variation was expected, permitted, perhaps even hoped for; but that no deliberate plans were laid to capitalize on an opportunity to experiment in any serious way with alternative delivery systems. Our conclusion on this sixth question is therefore mixed in the sense that while the project was carried out successfully, the compressed time-line for planning and other possible factors on which we have no particular data militated against development of a more sophisticated plan. Our conclusion on this question is that:

6. THE PROCESS OF DISSEMINATION WAS CARRIED OUT QUITE SUCCESSFULLY. HOWEVER THE PROJECT, PROBABLY BECAUSE OF THE SHORT LEAD-TIME AVAILABLE FOR DETAILED PLANNING, WAS NOT ABLE TO TEST ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATION.

Q.7. What were the factors or contextual variables which had an effect upon the dissemination and adoption process?

At the provincial level, the success which the project generally enjoyed seems to be attributable to the cooperation of a number of groups and agencies which have been involved with the in-service question for some time. While Alberta Education had the major input, the support of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, and the participating school jurisdictions was crucial for this project. As a cooperative effort, therefore, it is somewhat unique on the North American scene. At the local and regional level, the simplest and, we believe, the most striking comment is that the dedicated work of highly competent professionals including the resource teachers, regional office consultants, and local district and school administrators made for a successful project. If the notion of a "multiplier effect" makes any sense in this context, it was evident that Alberta Education and the other participating agencies obtained very positive effects for their in-service investment. The conclusions are that:

7a. AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL, THE MAJOR INPUTS BY ALBERTA EDUCATION AND THE COOPERATION OF OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS PROVIDED BOTH THE CLIMATE OF SUPPORT AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATON.

7b. AT THE LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL, THE IMPORTANT FACTORS WERE THE PROFESSIONALISM AND COMPETENCE OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

Conclusions about the Project Objectives

The objectives of the Social Studies In-Service Project were presented in the Introduction to this evaluation report. Conclusions regarding the objectives are presented below.

Objective 1 (For Alberta Teachers)

(a) to ensure that all social studies teachers in Alberta have a working understanding of the characteristics and requirements of the 1981 social studies curriculum;

(b) to provide all social studies teachers in Alberta with opportunities to broaden their repertoire of instructional strategies for social studies.

On the basis of the findings reported above, our conclusion is that:

8a. MOST SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN ALBERTA HAVE AN ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE 1981 SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM.

8b. MOST SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN ALBERTA HAVE BEEN ABLE TO BROADEN THEIR REPERTOIRE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Objective 2 (For Alberta Social Studies)

(a) to ensure that the 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum, which has been the subject of considerable public and professional interest, is given a fair chance for successful implementation;

(b) to provide a means for heightened professional and public dialogue about issues pertaining to social studies philosophy and methodology in Alberta.

Our conclusions with respect to the second set of objectives are that:

9a. THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT PROVIDES A STRONG BASE FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1981 CURRICULUM.

9b. THE PROJECT LED TO HEIGHTENED PROFESSIONAL DIALOGUE. THE OBJECTIVE OF INCREASED PUBLIC DIALOGUE WAS, ESSENTIALLY, MINIMALLY ADDRESSED BY THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT.

Objective 3 (For Curriculum Implementation in Alberta)

- to test the viability of a peer-based consultative approach to curriculum implementation in Alberta schools.

Our conclusion is that:

10. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT SOLIDLY CONFIRMED THE VIABILITY OF A PEER-BASED CONSULTATIVE APPROACH.

Recommendations

The external evaluators have the following recommendations to make to Alberta Education. These recommendation are, in the main, intended to assist policy-makers considering possible future projects with goals similar to this one.

1. INCREASED LEAD-TIME SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

Increased lead-time was a change that was repeatedly mentioned in the data of this study. Local school jurisdictions noted that increased lead-time is necessary in order that they have the opportunity to make appropriate decisions for planning the implementation of in-service projects. Furthermore, they stressed that financial information must be provided early enough so that it can be included in local budget discussions.

In the opinion of the external evaluators the timing of the Minister's announcement of the project did not provide Alberta Education staff with the time needed to establish effective two-way communication with various agencies (Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, etc.) at the provincial level or with local school jurisdictions before launching the project.

Increased lead-time could also be used for developing detailed plans which would pay greater attention to selection and training of resource teachers than was possible in the Social Studies In-Service Project. Moreover, the curriculum and instructional materials needed for the typical in-service project could be developed, field-tested and better readied for delivery.

2. COOPERATION BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE THE BASIC STRATEGY FOR IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

The success of this project was traceable, in part, to cooperation among a number of parties. This approach will continue to be the most viable one for future projects in other subject areas.

3. SOME TYPE OF FORMAL FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE PART OF THE PLAN FOR IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

It is clear in the findings of this study that follow-up work is needed. There will likely be a variety of follow-up activities in some jurisdictions but full capitalization upon the investment in similar projects would seem to require a deliberately planned set of follow-up activities by Alberta Education to ensure that the momentum developed at local and regional levels during the project is maintained.

Indeed, given the results of this project, Alberta Education might begin developing policies which would lead to the implementation of in-service projects in other subject areas. The development of such policies would serve to direct and coordinate all future in-service activities for the department, thereby providing necessary information which would allow local school jurisdictions to engage in long range planning procedures.

4. THE PEER-BASED CONSULTATIVE APPROACH SHOULD BE STRONGLY CONSIDERED AS AN APPROACH IN FUTURE PROJECTS.

Comment

The sheer demands of numbers of people required for such projects suggests that there is no other practical approach to implementing province-wide projects of this type. Moreover, the high level of acceptance accorded the resource teachers in the Social Studies In-Service Project indicates that this is an important characteristic of a well-designed project.

5. AN EVALUATION COMPONENT SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE REQUIRED IN FUTURE PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE.

Comment

While such a recommendation from an external evaluator may appear to be self-serving, it is reasonably clear to us that the evaluation component, however demanding on project personnel, is quite necessary from both an accountability and quality standpoint. Furthermore, data from such an evaluation component serves as formative information for future projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN-SERVICE PROJECT	1
EVALUATION QUESTIONS	3
DATA SOURCES	4
PROCEDURES	5
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	8
Information from Resource Teachers	8
Classroom Teacher Pre- and Post-Tests	9
Classroom Teacher Opinions about the Project	11
Results of Classroom Teacher Interviews	25
Survey of Resource Teachers	26
Interviews of Resource Teachers	45
Resource Teacher Log Books	46
Workshop Observations	47
Stakeholder Opinions about the Project	48
Stakeholder Interviews	49
Case Studies of Selected Jurisdictions	50
CONCLUSIONS	59
Conclusions about the Evaluation Questions	59
Conclusions about the Project Objectives	62
RECOMMENDATIONS	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A 66

Responses to Resource Teacher Pre-Questionnaire 66

APPENDIX B 73

Resource Teacher Questionnaire 74
Resource Teacher Interviews 80
Log Books 86
Stakeholder Questionnaire 92
Stakeholder Interviews 98

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Sampling Design 6

Table 2 - Total Number of Years as a Teacher 11

Table 3 - Total Number of Years of Teaching Social Studies 12

Table 4 - Grade Level Teaching Social Studies 1981 - 1982 12

Table 5 - Years of Teacher Preparation 13

Table 6 - University Major and Minor 13

Table 7 - University Major by Zone 14

Table 8 - University Minor by Zone 14

Table 9 - School Days of Social Studies In-Service 15

Table 10 - School Days of Social Studies In-Service Received 16

Table 11 - Helpfulness of the Social Studies In-Service 17

Table 12 - Personally Learned from the Social Studies Project about Content of 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide 17

Table 13 - Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service Project About Alternative Teaching Strategies 18

Table 14 - Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service About Curriculum Resources 19

Table 15 - Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis of Curriculum Guide 19

Table 16 - Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis on Teaching Strategies 20

Table 17 - Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis on Curriculum Resources 21

Table 18 - Overall Attitude Toward the Social Studies In-Service Project 22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 19 - Ratings of Recall Regarding Social Studies Curriculum 23

Table 20 - Teacher Self-Ratings of Awareness Regarding 1981 Social Studies Curriculum 23

Table 21 - Percentage of Correct Teacher Responses to Questions C2 and C7 24

Table 22 - Attitudes Toward Two Aspects of 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide 24

Table 23 - Resource Teacher Questionnaire by Zone 26

Table 24 - Date Informed of Appointment as Resource Teacher 26

Table 25 - Term of Appointment 27

Table 26 - Number of Working Days as a Resource Teacher 28

Table 27 - Teacher In-Service Days by Zone 28

Table 28 - Number of Days Resource Teachers in Workshops 29

Table 29 - Number of Days Resource Teachers Spent on Activities ... 29

Table 30 - Module Preview by Resource Teachers 31

Table 31 - Resource Teacher Use of Modules with Classroom Teachers 32

Table 32 - Resource Teacher Use of Modules with Teachers According to Grade Levels 33

Table 33 - Resource Teacher Report of Value of Modules to Teachers 35

Table 34 - Contact Sessions 38

Table 35 - Contact Sessions by Term of Appointment 39

Table 36 - Resource Teacher Rating of Contact Sessions by Zone 39

Table 37 - Resource Teacher Rating of Contact Sessions by Term of Appointment 40

LIST OF TABLES

Table 38 - Resource Teacher Rating of Contact with Alberta Education by Zone 41

Table 39 - Resource Teacher Rating of Contact with Alberta Education by Term of Appointment 41

Table 40 - Rating of Organizational Assignment by Resource Teachers 42

Table 41 - Rating of Organizational Assignment by Zone 43

Table 42 - Resource Teacher Rating of Teacher Attitudes Toward 1981 Social Studies In-Service Project 43

Table 43 - Overall Rating of In-Service Project 45

Table 44 - Workshop Observation 47

Table 45 - Stakeholder Ratings 49

Table 46 - Distribution of Resource Teachers by Zone 67

Table 47 - Sex Distribution of Resource Teachers by Zone 67

Table 48 - Grade Levels of Social Studies Taught 67

Table 49 - Other Teaching Experience in Number of Years 68

Table 50 - Degrees Held by Resource Teachers 68

Table 51 - Degrees Held by Resource Teachers by Zone 68

Table 52 - Major and Minor Areas of Study 69

Table 53 - Areas of Study by Zone 69

Table 54 - Number of Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction Courses Taken 70

Table 55 - Years of Professional Development Related to Social Studies 70

Table 56 - Years of Professional Involvement Related to Social Studies 70

Table 57 - Perceptions of Why Chosen as a Resource Teacher 71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 58 - Resource Teacher Reasons for Accepting Position 72

Table 59 - Positive Aspects of In-Service Project 75

Table 60 - Negative Aspects of In-Service Project 76

Table 61 - Suggested Changes for the In-Service Project 77

Table 62 - Personal Benefits Resulting from In-Service Project 78

Table 63 - Personal Losses Resulting from In-Service Project 79

Table 64 - Responses to Questions 1 and 2 81

Table 65 - Responses to Question 2 81

Table 66 - "High Points" of Resource Teacher Involvement 82

Table 67 - Problems 83

Table 68 - Changes 84

Table 69 - Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books 87

Table 70 - Positive Side Effects 93

Table 71 - Negative Side Effect 94

Table 72 - Suggested Changes 96

Table 73 - Stakeholder Interview 99

Table 74 - Stakeholder Interviews - Suggested Changes 100

DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN-SERVICE PROJECT

The Social Studies In-Service Project was announced in the Alberta Legislature April 19, 1981 by the Honourable David King, Minister of Education. The announcement represented the culmination of several years of public, professional and political concern for the quality of social studies instruction in Alberta schools. It had been preceded by a major assessment of social studies instruction (the 1975 Downey Report), extensive projects to develop social studies learning resources materials (most notably the Alberta Heritage Learning Resources Project 1978-1980), two new provincial curricula (the 1978 Alberta Social Studies Interim Curriculum and 1981 Alberta Social Studies Curriculum) and a major collaborative attempt to create a suitable design for systematic in-service education (the Tri-Partite Report on In-service Education, 1980).

As an approach to teacher in-service during the implementation of a new curriculum the Alberta Social Studies In-Service Project was characterized by several distinct features:

1. Peer-based conduct of in-service activities

   A cadre of 125 practising social studies teachers were released from regular duties to carry out the major activities of the project. The 125 "resource teachers", as they were known, were deployed in their home jurisdictions, with some exceptions. The project operated between September 1, 1981 and January 31, 1982, although, again, there were a number of notable exceptions to this generalization.

2. Consultation/demonstration as the approach to in-service

   Resource teachers were expected to carry out systematic workshops with practising teachers within their jurisdictions and provide follow-up consultation with individual teachers, school staffs, administrators and parents. Under the terms of the project it was expected that all social studies teachers in Alberta, Grades 1-12, would receive two days of practical workshops during the duration of the project and have ready access to their resource teachers for additional consultation and problem-solving.

3. Shared responsibility for project management

Responsibility for management of the project was shared between the major stakeholders in Alberta education. Salaries and expenses for resource teachers were paid by Alberta Education. Alberta Education also assumed responsibility for training resource teachers, for coordinating the distribution of in-service materials and arranging regular contact sessions. Local school boards selected their resource teachers, arranged teacher releases for the workshops, supervised all activities at the local level, and assumed additional incidental expenses. Resource teachers, supported by the Alberta Teachers' Association, agreed to implement the provincial requirements for the project as well as a wide variety of locally developed guidelines. Resource teachers maintained continuous log book files on their activities.

The objectives* of the Social Studies In-Service Project were stated in the resource teacher's Handbook as follows:

1. For Alberta Teachers
   (a) to ensure that all social studies teachers in Alberta have a working understanding of the characteristics and requirements of the 1981 social studies curriculum;
   (b) to provide all social studies teachers in Alberta with opportunities to broaden their repertoire of instructional strategies for social studies.
2. For Alberta Social Studies
   (a) to ensure that the 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum, which has been the subject of considerable public and professional interest, is given a fair chance for successful implementation;
   (b) to provide a means for heightened professional and public dialogue about issues pertaining to social studies philosophy and methodology in Alberta.

*Note: A number of different versions of the statement of objectives appeared in documents circulating in the spring of 1981. Because this version appeared most widely in the circulated official documents, it was accepted by the external evaluators as a basis for the evaluation design.

3. For Curriculum Implementation in Alberta
   - to test the viability of a peer-based consultative approach to curriculum implementation in Alberta schools.

This document is a report of the evaluation of the In-Service Project. The remainder of the report is comprised of the following sections:

1. Evaluation Questions
2. Data Sources
3. Procedures
4. Summary of Results
5. Conclusions
6. Recommendations
7. Appendices

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions which were the focus of this study were developed by the external evaluators in consultation with the Evaluation Steering Committee. The questions were as follows:

1. What effect does the in-service project have upon the knowledge of participating teachers?
2. What effect does the in-service project have upon the attitude of participating teachers?
3. What "models" for in-service were used? (How was the in-service implemented?)
4. Which "models" were most effective? (Which methods of implementation were most effective?)
5. What side effects does the project have?
6. How well was the process of planned dissemination carried out?
7. What were the factors or contextual variables which had an effect upon the dissemination and adoption process?

DATA SOURCES

The data that were used to answer the evaluation questions were gathered through a combination of four methods: questionnaires, interviews, observation and document analysis. Specifically, the data sources were:

A. Questionnaires (See Appendix A)
   1. Classroom Teacher Questionnaire
   2. Resource Teacher Pre-Questionnaire
   3. Classroom Teacher Questionnaire B
   4. Classroom Teacher Survey
   5. Resource Teacher Questionnaire
   6. Case Study Questionnaire
   7. Stakeholder Questionnaire

B. Interviews
   1. Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule (Pre)
   2. Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule (Post)
   3. Interview Schedule for Resource Teachers
   4. Stakeholder Interview Schedule

C. Workshop Observation Record

D. Document Analyses
   1. Content Analysis Record of Log Books
   2. Analysis of Other Project Documents

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaires were designed by the external evaluators in consultation with the Evaluation Steering Committee.

The information and opinion items included in the questionnaires were of three general types:

A. Items with pre-defined, Likert-type responses. These, typically, asked the respondents to state an opinion about a particular matter by means of a 5-point scale, ranging, for example, from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

B. Items requiring respondents to present, in their own words, their opinions, comments or descriptive information.

C. Items which were a combination of types A and B above. These contained pre-defined response categories of the Likert type but, in addition, asked the respondent to comment, provide further information, deal with "other" information, and so on.

Each of the questionnaires was field tested with a small group of appropriate respondents, and as a result of such field testing, some revisions were made. The contention of the evaluators is that the instruments were sufficiently reliable and valid to be used for producing the data required for the study.

Interview Design

The interview schedules were modelled directly upon the questionnaire design. The main purpose of the interviews was to give participants ample opportunities to express their opinions, explain subtleties of the Social Studies In-Service Project, and in general, communicate more fully with the evaluation team.

Observation Design

For the observations of the workshops, a set of high-inference items based on research in adult instruction were used. The observation procedure required observers to make a judgement of the quality of the workshop on a Likert-type scale.

Document Analysis

The resource teacher log books were analyzed and summarized using content analysis procedures. Essentially, the procedure for analysis sorted the information into appropriate categories and provided information as to how many times a particular category of information was found in the raw data.

PROCEDURES

Sampling Design

In Table 1 a summary of the sampling design is provided. For each data source the actual sample size is provided according to zone. There are six zones in the province; throughout this report Zones 2 and 3 are treated

together in the various tables. Also provided in Table 1 is information on the number of returned or completed data sources.

The six zones can be identified in terms of the location of the Regional Offices of Alberta Education. They are as follows:

Zone 1 Grande Prairie
Zones 2 & 3 Edmonton
Zone 4 Red Deer
Zone 5 Calgary
Zone 6 Lethbridge

Table 1

SAMPLING DESIGN

Data Source	Sample Size According to Zone 1	2 and 3	4	5	6	Totals	% Returned
Classroom Teacher Questionnaire A							
Distributed	200	1140	300	380	280	2300	16
Returned	26	203	22	126	0	377	
Resource Teacher Pre-Questionnaire							
Distributed	10	57	15	19	14	115	93
Returned	10	52	14	18	13	107	
Classroom Teacher Questionnaire B							
Distributed	26	203	22	126	0	377	40
Returned	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	152	
Classroom Teacher Survey							
Distributed	127	971	107	539	201	1965	73
Returned	109	736	102	342	147	1436	
Resource Teacher Questionnaire							
Distributed	10	57	15	19	19	120	71
Returned	6	46	7	12	14	85	

Table 1 (continued)

SAMPLING DESIGN

Data Source	Sample Size According to Zone 1	2 and 3	4	5	6	Totals	% Returned
Case Study Questionnaire							
Distributed / Returned	1 / 0	2 / 2	0 / 0	2 / 2	2 / 2	7 / 7	86
Stakeholder Questionnaire							
Distributed / Returned	10 / 8	48 / 47	12 / 12	18 / 18	12 / 12	100 / 97	97
Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule - Pre	3	47	18	12	25	105	
Classroom Teacher Interview Schedule - Post	6	39	8	14	8	75	
Interview Schedule for Resource Teachers	3	13	4	6	4	30	
Stakeholder One-to-One Interview Schedule	2	9	2	4	3	20	
Workshop Observation Record	0	15	4	4	5	28	
Log Book Content	3	13	4	5	5	30	

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Information from Resource Teachers

Early in September of 1981 the resource teachers were requested to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire asked for biographical information, resource teachers' perceptions of why they had been selected as a resource teacher, and reasons why they had accepted the position. Tables summarizing the background information are provided in Appendix B. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 107 resource teachers.

The background and biographical information may be summarized as follows:

1. Two-thirds of the respondents were male; one-third were female. (In the total group of 114 resource teachers, as listed in the Resource Teacher's Handbook, the breakdown was 56% males and 44% females).
2. All grade levels were well represented in the group.
3. The range in teaching experience was from 1 to 16 years.
4. All but a small number held at least one degree.
5. A majority (51.5%) had majored in fields other than social studies.
6. The resource teachers had generally not participated extensively in professional activities related to social studies. (However, it should be noted that several of the resource teachers did not respond to the questions requesting this information)
7. The resource teachers felt that the main reasons for their selection included, in order of priority: past experience, interest in social studies, personal skills, educational background, recommendations by colleagues, teaching competency, and the absence of competition for the positions.
8. The main reasons identified for their acceptance of the assignment included: a need for a change, the challenge, learning opportunities, desire to help implementation, opportunity to work with others, interest in social studies, and personal and professional growth.

Discussion. No particular conclusions can be drawn from the data on the characteristics of the resource teachers and it would be difficult to attempt any attribution of success or failure of the in-service project to these

characteristics. What may be noteworthy, however, is that a rather wide variation existed on most of the characteristics and therefore no typical personal profile was to be found in the resource teacher group.

It seemed that biographical or demographic characteristics mattered less than interest in and perceived competency for the in-service project.

Classroom Teacher Pre- and Post-Tests

The Evaluation Steering Committee and the external evaluators were of the opinion that a pre- and post-test design could be used to determine what changes in knowledge and attitude would occur on the part of the classroom teachers involved in the in-service project. The external evaluators had some concerns about the possible negative reactions such an approach might generate among resource teachers and classroom teachers and therefore suggested that some alternative approach be used. Among the proposed alternatives were: (1) a "post-test only" design using the knowledge and attitude items which were eventually used for this part of the data collection; (2) a self-rating instrument which would ask teachers simply to report their own opinions as to how much they had learned about a given area. In any case the Evaluation Steering Committee decided to implement the pre- and post-test design and in the fall of 1981 the pre-test instruments were distributed. Several problems affected the distribution, completion and collection of these instruments.

1. Development and delivery problems delayed the arrival of the instruments at the various regions and school jurisdictions.
2. Some resource teachers and/or regional office consultants reacted negatively to the idea of testing teachers.
3. In a number of cases the teachers had already been involved in the first phase of the project and had attended at least one day of in-service. Therefore, a pre-test was not deemed to be appropriate.

As a result of these problems, the number of completed pre-tests was, as shown in Table 1, fairly small. In one zone, no pre-test questionnaires were returned.

The topics dealt with in this study included the following:

1. The major goal of the 1981 social studies curriculum.
2. Topics prescribed per grade level of social studies taught.

3. Percentage of Canadian content prescribed.
4. The three types of objectives listed in the 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide.
5. The three categories of value objectives.
6. The three components of the knowledge objectives.
7. The three major categories of skill objectives.
8. Status of the "process of social enquiry".
9. One Kanata Kit per grade level of social studies taught.
10 One teaching unit per grade level of social studies taught.

In addition, attitudes towards the Social Studies In-Service Project and the social studies curriculum were also measured.

The results of the analyses of the pre- and post-test data were:

1. The average percentage of correct answers on the pre-test was 52.6%; on the post-test the average was 57.4%. That is, there was some growth in knowledge.

Note: Although there was an increase in the knowledge of teachers from the pre- to the post-test, these results must be treated with caution. Because of the problems described above, the pre- and post-scores were not statistically analyzed, hence the caution with the results.

2. There was a slight increase (3.90 to 3.95 on a 5-point scale) in teacher attitudes to the in-service project.

Note: Although the increase was not great in itself, it should be noted that the starting point (3.90) was rather high. It could be conjectured that expectations for the project were high to begin with and that, at the end of the project, the estimates of its success had increased.

Discussion of results. These results must be treated with great caution. The problems described above limited the sample size and representativeness and may have had effects upon the responses themselves. Therefore the results were not subjected to statistical analysis. However, the post-test scores were higher and can, in conjunction with other data in this report, provide a basis for drawing important conclusions.

Classroom Teacher Opinions about the Project

In May - June of 1982 a large-scale, province-wide survey of classroom teachers was carried out. The sample of school jurisdictions had been randomly selected to provide proportional representation in terms of geographic location, school jurisdiction type (public, separate, division, county) and school jurisdiction size. The questionnaires for the survey were distributed through the office of the superintendent of schools in the jurisdictions (see the letters from Alberta Education [April 30, 1982] and the external evaluators [May 20, 1982] in Appendix A). As indicated in Table 1 the rate of return for the questionnaire was quite high (73%).

In the tables below the results of the analysis are provided on an item-by-item basis. In many cases, the results are reported in terms of the six zones into which Alberta is divided. Both frequencies and percentages are reported in these tables.

The first set of items on the classroom teacher questionnaire sought biographical information. The results are reported in Tables 2 to 8 following.

Table 2

Total Number of Years as a Teacher

Number of Years	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
Less than 5	52	176	32	94	30	384	26.7
5 - 10	25	216	26	70	48	385	26.8
11 - 15	15	139	18	81	23	276	19.2
16 - 20	5	76	13	56	20	170	11.8
21 - 25	7	60	7	17	16	107	7.5
26 - 30	4	40	4	14	7	69	4.8
Over 30	1	26	2	10	3	42	2.9
Missing responses	0	3	0	0	0	3	0.2
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0

Table 3

Total Number of Years of Teaching Social Studies

Number of Years	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
Less than 5	59	237	42	115	45	498	34.7
5 - 10	25	212	24	87	46	394	27.4
11 - 15	10	117	13	71	24	235	16.4
16 - 20	7	78	13	40	15	153	10.7
21 - 25	5	42	5	14	12	78	5.4
26 - 30	2	29	3	10	3	47	3.3
30	1	19	2	4	2	28	1.9
Missing responses	0	2	0	0	0	3	0.2
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0

Table 4

Grade Level Teaching Social Studies 1981 - 1982

Grade Level	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 - 3	84	40	40	294	58	516	35.4
4 - 6	109	36	38	271	52	506	34.7
All elementary	7	0	0	3	1	10	0.7
7 - 9	85	22	17	139	30	293	20.1
10 - 12	60	11	9	54	10	144	9.9
7 - 12	2	6	5	3	2	18	1.2
All grades	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Missing responses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	341	109	102	764	143	1459	100.0

Of these teachers, 89 % (n=1428) had four or more years of teacher preparation; 79 had no degree, 358 had a B.A., 47 had a B.Sc., 1151 had a B.Ed., 36 had an M.A., 5 had an M.Sc., 65 had an M.Ed., 5 had a Ph.D or Ed.D., and 171 had other degrees. Analysis by zone of the data from this question may be found in Table 17.

Table 5

Years of Teacher Preparation

Number of Years	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
Less than 3	12	57	6	23	11	109	7.6
3	7	22	6	8	3	46	3.2
4	64	439	69	171	99	842	58.6
5	19	124	18	59	25	265	18.5
6	7	90	3	57	9	166	11.6
Missing responses	0 109	4 736	0 102	4 342	0 147	8 1436	0.6 100.0

Table 6

University Major and Minor

Category	MAJOR		MINOR	
	Total Sample Size	Percentage	Total Sample Size	Percentage
English	223	15.5	219	15.3
History	224	15.6	136	9.5
Social Studies	314	21.9	137	9.5
Other	629	43.8	695	48.4
Missing responses	46 1436	3.2 100.0	249 1436	17.3 100.0

Table 7

University Major by Zone

Category	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
English	19	50	14	118	22	223	15.5
History	17	75	20	87	25	224	15.6
Social Studies	19	79	19	165	32	314	21.9
Other	51	133	45	340	60	629	43.8
Missing responses	3	5	4	16	8	36	2.5
	109	342	102	736	147	1436	100.0

Table 8

University Minor by Zone

Category	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
English	26	110	17	51	15	204	14.2
History	12	58	4	46	16	136	9.5
Social Studies	12	79	8	30	8	137	9.5
Other	45	356	55	167	72	695	48.4
Missing responses	14	133	18	48	36	249	17.3
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0

The results can be summarized as follows:

1. A fairly wide range of years of experience as a teacher and specifically as a social studies teacher was represented in the sample (Tables 2 and 3).
2. Teachers from all grade levels were represented in the sample (Table 4).
3. The great majority of respondents had at least one degree (Table 5).
4. A majority of respondents had majored in fields other than social studies (Tables 6, 7 and 8).

In tables 9 and 10 the responses to questions about the number of days of in-service are reported. Table 9 lists the number of school days of social studies in-service which each teacher received. An analysis of these data by zone follows this in Table 10.

Table 9

School Days of Social Studies In-Service

Days	Total Sample Size	Percentage
None	21	1.5
One-half day	47	3.3
One day	236	16.4
One and one-half days	127	8.8
Two days	907	63.2
More than two days	72	5.0
Missing responses	26	1.8
	1436	100.0

Table 10

School Days of Social Studies In-Service Received

Days	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
None	4	14	2	0	1	21	1.5
One-half day	2	41	1	4	1	49	3.4
One day	9	182	6	29	10	236	16.4
One and one-half days	3	83	4	26	11	127	8.8
Two days	87	358	84	261	117	907	63.2
More than two days	4	44	2	18	4	72	5.0
Missing responses	2	14	3	4	3	26	1.8
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0

The data indicated the following:

1. In approximately 30% of the cases the teachers reported that less than two days of in-service were received (Table 9).
2. In Zones 2 and 3 in particular a large number of respondents reported less than two days of in-service (Table 10).

In Tables 11 to 20 inclusive, teacher opinions about various aspects of the project are reported.

In Table 11, the responses to a key question, How helpful was the in-service project? are presented.

Table 11

Helpfulness of the Social Studies In-Service

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Not Helpful At All	11	48	2	9	2	72	5.0
2	26	121	23	44	20	234	16.3
3	38	241	39	101	43	462	32.2
4	27	237	29	135	56	484	33.7
5 Extremely Helpful	5	80	7	53	24	169	11.8
Missing responses	2	9	2	0	2	15	1.0
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	2.897	3.168	3.160	3.628	3.586	3.312	

On a scale from 1 (not helpful at all) to 5 (extremely helpful), the great majority of responses were 3 or above.

In Tables 12 to 17, teacher opinion about several specific aspects of the project are reported.

Table 12

Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service Project About Content of 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Very Little	11	62	4	22	11	110	7.7
2	20	114	18	43	13	208	14.5

Table 12 (continued)

Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service Project
About Content of 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
3	44	249	39	103	44	479	33.4
4	25	228	34	137	53	477	33.2
5 Very Much	6	74	6	35	25	146	10.2
Missing responses	3	1	1	2	1	8	0.6
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	2.953	3.131	3.198	3.446	3.511	3.240	

Table 13

Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service Project
About Alternative Teaching Strategies

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Very Little	13	82	6	30	9	140	9.7
2	24	159	26	72	37	318	22.1
3	42	256	42	129	57	526	36.6
4	23	190	24	98	32	367	25.6
5 Very Much	5	36	3	12	11	67	4.7
Missing responses	2	13	1	1	1	18	1.3
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	2.842	2.847	2.921	3.055	3.996	2.932	

Table 14

Personally Learned from the Social Studies In-Service Project About Curriculum Resources

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Very Little	9	58	1	15	5	88	6.1
2	26	115	11	35	13	200	13.9
3	29	219	42	84	44	418	29.1
4	31	245	36	137	54	503	35.0
5 Very Much	11	86	11	70	29	207	14.4
Missing responses	3	13	1	1	2	20	1.4
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	3.085	3.177	3.446	3.755	3.679	3.382	

Table 15

Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis of Curriculum Guide

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Low Emphasis	10	39	6	22	4	81	5.6
2	20	103	13	46	7	189	13.2
3	28	221	28	101	37	415	28.9

Table 15 (continued)

Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis of Curriculum Guide

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
4	27	224	39	119	49	458	31.9
5 High Emphasis	21	133	13	51	49	267	18.6
Missing responses	3	16	3	3	1	26	1.8
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	3.274	3.619	3.404	3.490	3.944	3.455	

Table 16

Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis on Teaching Strategies

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Low Emphasis	4	18	1	3	1	81	5.6
2	8	28	3	8	8	189	13.2
3	25	134	22	51	32	415	28.9
4	31	248	33	132	68	458	31.9
5 High Emphasis	31	248	33	132	37	267	18.6
Missing responses	3	13	4	3	1	24	
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	3.792	3.993	4.020	4.056	3.893	3.382	

Table 17

Teacher Opinion Regarding Emphasis
on Curriculum Resources

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Low Emphasis	4	9	2	1	0	16	1.1
2	2	16	20	6	1	25	1.7
3	18	113	39	51	19	221	15.4
4	39	291	38	143	62	574	40.0
5 High Emphasis	43	296	3	140	62	579	40.3
Missing responses	3	11	0	1	3	21	1.5
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	4.086	4.159	4.121	4.198	4.244	4.184	

In general, the results are positive in the sense that teachers were usually above the mid-point of 3 in their average responses. There was some difference across zones as indicated in these tables.

In Table 18, teacher attitudes towards the in-service project are reported. This again was a key item in terms of the evaluation of the project.

Table 18

Overall Attitude Toward the Social Studies In-Service Project

Rating	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Size	Percentage
1 Very Unfavourable	8	45	3	8	7	71	4.9
2	23	108	11	33	11	186	13.0
3	40	208	39	85	35	407	28.3
4	26	240	31	123	55	475	33.1
5 Very Favourable	10	124	17	93	38	282	19.6
Missing responses	2	11	1	0	1	15	1.0
	109	736	102	342	147	1436	100.0
Means	3.065	3.301	3.475	3.865	3.747	3.491	

The results show a generally positive attitude towards the project by a majority of teachers.

In Tables 19 to 22, some teacher estimates of their own growth and learning are provided.

Table 19

Ratings of Recall Regarding Social Studies Curriculum

Item of Recall	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Mean
			(Mean Ratings*)			
Major goal of curriculum.	3.25	3.34	3.37	3.68	3.32	3.39
Three types of objectives.	3.84	3.52	3.64	3.83	3.49	3.66
Three categories of value objectives.	2.83	2.75	2.84	3.01	2.72	2.83
Three components of knowledge objectives.	2.90	2.97	3.10	3.18	2.83	3.00
Two major categories of skill objectives.	3.03	3.04	3.24	3.37	2.98	3.13

* Rating Categories
5 With Certainty
4
3
2
1 No

Table 20

Teacher Self-Ratings of Awareness Regarding
1981 Social Studies Curriculum

Item of Awareness	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Mean
			(Mean Rating*)			
Prescribed topics for grade levels teaching.	4.44	4.50	4.73	4.65	4.56	4.58
Recommended Kanata Kits for grade levels teaching.	4.67	4.70	4.80	4.82	4.71	4.74
Recommended teaching units for grade levels teaching.	4.43	4.53	4.68	4.62	4.47	4.55

* Rating Categories
5 Fully Aware
4
3
2
1 Not Aware At All

Table 21

Percentage of Correct Teacher Responses to Questions C2 and C7

Question	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Percentage
C2- Percentage of Canadian content prescribed across curriculum generally.	33	26	33	38	29	32
C7- Status of the "process of social inquiry".	88	76	82	79	71	79

Table 22

Attitudes Toward Two Aspects of 1981 Social Studies Curriculum Guide

Curriculum Aspect	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4 (Mean Ratings*)	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total Sample Mean
Content of 1981 social studies curriculum for grade level(s) teaching.	3.40	3.43	3.66	3.80	3.56	3.57
Teaching the 1981 social studies curriculum for grade level(s) teaching.	3.49	3.52	3.73	3.86	3.67	3.65

* Rating Categories
5 Very Favourable
4
3
2
1 Very Unfavourable

The results show a positive opinion about teacher growth and learning especially with respect to "awareness of the 1981 curriculum".

Discussion of results. The results reported in this section constitute a major part of the evaluation study. Given the large sample size and the widely representative nature of the sample, it is the opinion of the external evaluators that these data should be taken seriously. Generally the results are positive. The in-service project was seen by teachers in general as an effective one in terms of their awareness of the social studies curriculum and their ability to work within classrooms. However, the finding that not all teachers received the full two days of mandated in-service should perhaps be considered by planners of any future projects of a similar nature. (See the letters in Appendix A dated May 7 and June 3 from the Associate Deputy Minister of Alberta Education to the school jurisdictions.)

Results of Classroom Teacher Interviews

A number of classroom teachers were interviewed both before and after the in-service project. During the interviews, three questions were asked: (1) What do you think about the Alberta social studies curriculum? (2) What do (did) you think of the Social Studies In-Service Project? and (3) What do you (did you) hope to gain from the In-Service Project?

The results may be summarized as follows:

1. A positive opinion about the Alberta social studies curriculum was expressed by teachers.
2. A generally positive opinion about the In-Service Project was expressed by teachers.
3. Teachers reported gains in knowledge and skills as well as acquaintance with learning resources as a result of the project.

Discussion of results. It should be noted that, as with most interview data, the actual number of individuals making a particular statement was sometimes fairly low. Therefore, generalization is at best tentative. However, our analysis attempted to compare positive with negative and/or neutral statements and, on balance, the results were positive and therefore corroborated the results from the questionnaires.

Survey of Resource Teachers

A questionnaire was distributed to all resource teachers near the end of the 1981-82 school year. Completed instruments were received from 85 of the resource teachers. Therefore the rate of return was 68%.

In Tables 23 to 25, background information on this sample is provided.

Table 23

Resource Teacher Questionnaire by Zone

Zone	Number Distributed	Percentage of Total Sample	Number Received	Percentage of Total Sample
1	10	8	6	5
2&3	57	52	46	38
4	15	11	7	6
5	19	18	12	10
6	19	10	14	12
Total	120	100	85	71

Table 24

Date Informed of Appointment as Resource Teacher

Month	Frequency n = 84	Percentage
May/81	19	23
June/81	54	64
July/81	8	10
August/81	1	1
September/81	1	1
December/81	1	1

There were three questionnaires in which the term of appointment was not specified. Included in the September 1/82 to January 31/82 category were three cases in which the term of appointment was for less than 5 months (25 days, 73 days, 60 days) and two cases in which the appointment was on a half-time basis and ran from September 1/82 to June 25/82. The results of this analysis appear in Table 25.

Table 25

Term of Appointment

Length of Term	Frequency n = 82	Percentage
September 1/82 - January 31/82	62	76
September 1/82 - June 25/82	16	20
January 31/82 - June 25/82	4	5

The results can be summarized as follows:

1. The returned questionnaires came from all six zones of the province and seem to represent, in a general way, the population figures for the zones (Table 23).
2. A majority of the resource teachers had been informed of their assignment by July of 1981 (Table 24).
3. The great majority had terms of appointment which ended on January 31, 1982 (Table 25).

In Tables 26 to 29, some data descriptive of resource teachers' activities are presented.

Table 26

Number of Working Days as a Resource Teacher

Number of Days	Frequency n = 77	Percentage
200	9	12
190 - 199	3	4
110 - 120	4	5
100 - 109	16	21
95 - 99	32	42
90 - 94	8	10
45 - 53	5	6

Table 27

Teacher In-Service Days by Zone

Grade Level	Number of In-Service Days				
	Zone 1	Zone 2&3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6
Elementary	2	1 - 2	2	2	2
Junior High	2	1 - 2	2	2	2
Senior High	2	1 - 2	2	2	2

Table 28

Number of Days Resource Teachers in Workshops

Size of Group	Average Number of Days Resource Teachers in Workshops of Various Sizes				
	Zone 1 n = 6	Zone 2&3 n = 46	Zone 4 n = 7	Zone 5 n = 12	Zone 6 n = 14
Small	11.0	8.6	1.2	13.0	8.2
Medium	8.0	5.2	9.7	11.1	2.7
Large	4.6	3.6	1.2	10.0	1.5

Table 29

Number of Days Resource Teachers Spent on Activities

Activities of Resource Teachers	Zone										Total Sample Mean %
	1 n=6	%	2&3 n=46	%	4 n=71	%	5 n=12	%	6 n=14	%	
Workshops	143	10	809	18	86	11	410	21	175	16	15
Individual consulting	436	31	947	21	216	27	458	23	334	31	26
Preparation of materials	214	15	950	22	219	27	472	24	191	18	21
Administration	93	7	570	13	92	11	162	8	64	6	9
Travelling	262	19	326	7	28	3	132	6	69	6	8
Self Training	83	6	400	9	83	10	153	7	98	9	8

Table 29 (continued)

Number of Days Resource Teachers Spent on Activities

Activities of Resource Teachers	Zone										Total Sample Mean %
	1 n=6	%	2&3 n=46	%	4 n=71	%	5 n=12	%	6 n=14	%	
Meeting with local level											
principals	49	3	153	3	12	1	23	1	22	2	2
supervisors	46	3	180	4	11	1	61	3	36	3	2
trustees	8	-	24	-	16	2	10	-	14	1	-
Meeting with other local groups											
parents	0	-	14	-	1	-	6	-	5	-	-
others	2	-	14	-	3	-	7	-	6	-	-
Other activities	52	4	157	3	39	5	18	-	46	4	3
Total	1387		4415		805		1904		1058		

The results were:

1. The number of working days corresponds with the terms of appointment reported above (Table 24).
2. The number of in-service days (Table 27) was generally reported as two; but in Zones 2 and 3 some resource teachers reported that only one day had been assigned.
3. Resource teachers used small, medium and large groups in their workshops (Table 28).
4. A wide variety of activities (Table 29) were used by resource teachers to achieve the project goals.

The resource teachers were asked a number of questions about the 14 Mentor Series modules (videotapes and handouts). The first question asked the resource teachers to report if they had previewed each of the modules. The responses were categorized as No, Yes or Partly. Table 30 provides the data on the resource teachers' reporting of their module preview activities.

Table 30

Module Preview by Resource Teachers
n = 85

Module Number	No		Yes		Partly	
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
1 Overview	2	2	82	96	1	1
2 Openers	0	0	84	98	1	1
3 Geographical Sources of Data	11	13	62	73	12	14
4 Interviews and Surveys	14	17	62	75	7	8
5 Historical Documents	4	5	72	87	7	8
6 Organizing and Analyzing Data	10	12	70	84	3	4
7 Evaluating Data	9	11	73	86	3	4
8 Synthesizing Data	8	10	73	87	3	4
9 Valuing	2	2	80	96	1	1
10 Resolving the Issue	10	12	65	78	8	10
11 Applying the Decision	20	24	57	69	6	7
12 Evaluation of Knowledge	9	11	69	82	6	7
13 Evaluation of Skills	9	11	69	84	6	5
14 Evaluation of Values	11	14	65	80	5	6

The resource teachers were also asked if they had used each of the modules with the teachers. They were asked to select how they had used each of the modules by checking one of three responses: No, As Is, and Adapted or Revised. Table 31 provides the data.

Table 31

Resource Teacher Use of Modules with Classroom Teachers
n = 85

Module Number	No		As Is		Adapted or Revised	
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
1 Overview	11	13	19	22	55	65
2 Openers	10	12	25	29	50	59
3 Geographical Sources of Data	67	82	2	2	13	16
4 Interviews and Surveys	63	81	1	1	14	18
5 Historical Documents	55	67	6	7	21	26
6 Organizing and Analyzing Data	37	46	6	8	37	46
7 Evaluating Data	43	52	5	6	35	43
8 Synthesizing Data	33	40	15	18	34	42
9 Valuing	15	18	19	23	48	59
10 Resolving the Issue	43	55	6	8	29	37
11 Applying the Decision	55	72	4	5	17	22
12 Evaluation of Knowledge	36	45	6	8	38	48
13 Evaluation of Skills	36	46	6	8	36	46
14 Evaluation of Values	34	44	9	12	35	45

The third question asked the resource teachers to identify the grade level(s) of the teachers with whom they had used each respective module. The resource teachers were asked to select Yes or No. In order to simplify Table 32, only the positive responses have been reported. That is, only the percentage of resource teachers that responded that they had used the module with the respective grade level(s) teachers have been presented.

Table 32

Resource Teachers Use of Modules With Teachers According to Grade Levels
n = 85

	Elementary Teachers		Junior High Teachers		Senior High Teachers	
Module	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
1 Overview	60	71	48	57	45	53
2 Openers	61	72	48	57	40	47
3 Geographical Sources of Data	12	14	7	8	4	5
4 Interviews and Surveys	9	11	7	8	3	4
5 Historical Documents	16	19	15	18	9	11
6 Organizing and Analyzing Data	34	40	21	25	18	21
7 Evaluating Data	27	32	21	25	17	20
8 Synthesizing Data	34	40	27	32	19	22

Table 32 (continued)

Resource Teachers Use of Modules With Teachers
According to Grade Levels
n = 85

	Elementary Teachers		Junior High Teachers		Senior High Teachers	
Module	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
9 Valuing	52	61	36	42	34	40
10 Resolving the Issue	22	26	19	22	11	13
11 Applying the Decision	13	15	12	14	9	11
12 Evaluation of Knowledge	25	29	24	28	19	22
13 Evaluation of Skills	30	35	23	27	21	25
14 Evaluation of Values	26	31	27	32	22	26

The final question regarding the Mentor Series modules asked the resource teachers to rate the value of the module for elementary, junior high and senior high teachers. The resource teachers were asked to rate the value of the modules according to the following four responses: No, Yes, Somewhat, and Not Applicable. Table 33 contains the information. In order to simplify the data, only the positive ratings of Yes and Somewhat have been reported. Furthermore, these two ratings have been collapsed and are presented in a combined percentage. The percentage refers to the number of resource teachers who rated the value of the respective modules Yes or Somewhat as compared to the total number of resource teachers who rated the modules. The actual numbers of resource teachers are also recorded in the table.

Table 33

Resource Teacher Report of Value of Modules to Teachers

Grade Level	Elementary Teachers		Junior High Teachers		Senior High Teachers	
Module	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %
1 Overview	60/67	90	48/59	81	44/54	82
2 Openers	62/65	95	49/52	94	43/47	92
3 Geographical Sources of Data	14	38/37	8	26/31	4	14/29
4 Interviews and Surveys	10/35	29	10/32	31	5/29	17
5 Historical Documents	18/40	45	16/36	44	11/33	33
6 Organizing and Analyzing Data	34/48	71	21/34	62	19/32	59
7 Evaluating Data	25/42	60	23/37	62	21/33	64
8 Synthesizing Data	32/45	71	25/39	65	20/36	57
9 Valuing	49/56	88	38/43	88	35/39	90

Table 33 (continued)

Resource Teacher Report of Value of Modules to Teachers

Grade Level	Elementary Teachers		Junior High Teachers		Senior High Teachers	
Module	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %	Sample Size / Responses	Yes & Somewhat %
10 Resolving the Issue	25/40	63	21/35	60	14/31	45
11 Applying the Decision	14/33	42	13/32	41	10/29	35
12 Evaluation of Knowledge	29/41	71	27/34	79	23/31	74
13 Evaluation of Skills	32/40	80	23/30	77	21/28	75
14 Evaluation of Values	27/41	75	26/35	74	24/32	75

These data show that:

1. The modules were previewed or partly previewed by a high percentage of the resource teachers (Table 30). As a matter of fact, Module 11, Applying the Decision, received the lowest percentage rating of being previewed (69%) or partly previewed (7%) by the resource teachers.
2. The resource teachers use of the modules with the teachers included not using the module at all, using the module "as is" and adapting or revising the module (Table 31). Over 50% of the resource teachers reported that they did not use the following modules: Module 7,

Evaluating Data (52%); Module 10, Resolving the Issue (55%); Module 5, Historical Documents (67%); Module 11, Applying the Decision (72%); Module 4, Interviews and Surveys (81%); and Module 3, Geographic Sources of Data (82%). In addition, the data showed that a very small percentage of the resource teachers used the modules "as is" with the teachers. The highest percentage of resource teachers (29%) reported that they had used Module 2, Openers, "as is". However, larger percentages reported that they had adapted or revised the modules before they used them with teachers. For example, over 50% of the resource teachers reported that prior to use with teachers they had adapted or revised the following modules: Module 2, Openers (59%); Module 9, Valuing (59%); and Module 1, Overview (65%).

3. Module use by resource teachers varied for teachers in different grade levels (Table 32). The modules used by the largest percentage of resource teachers for elementary teachers were Module 9, Valuing (61%); Module 1, Overview (71%); and Module 2, Openers (72%). At the junior high level, the highest percentage of resource teachers reported using Module 1, Overview (57%), and Module 2, Openers (57%). Similarly, at the senior high level the resource teachers used Module 2, Openers, and Module 1, Overview most often - 47% and 53% respectively.
4. There was variation in the value of each module for elementary, junior high and senior high teachers as reported by resource teachers in Table 33. However, Module 2, Openers, received the highest ratings of value. For the three divisional levels respectively, 95%, 94% and 92% of the total number of resource teachers that responded rated this module as valuable (Yes and Somewhat Collapsed).

In Tables 34 to 39 information and opinions on contact sessions sponsored by the In-Service Project are provided.

Table 34

Contact Sessions

Number of Days	Number of Zones Sponsoring		Number of Resource Teachers Attending	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
2	4	4	7	8
3	7	8	12	14
4	12	14	6	7
5	11	12	19	22
6	6	7	6	7
7	17	20	12	14
8	10	11	9	10
9	10	11	9	10
11	0	0	2	2
12	0	0	1	1
Missing data	8	9	2	2
Total	85		85	

An analysis of this same information on the basis of term of appointment is presented in Table 35. The results are calculated on the basis of the total number of contact session days sponsored by region and those attended by resource teachers. The means in both differ little for the terms of appointment September 1/81 to January 31/82 and September 1/81 to June 25/82. However the mean for both, related to the January 31/82 to June 25/82 terms of appointment, is less than half of the other means.

Table 35

Contact Sessions by Term of Appointment

Term of Appointment	Contact Sessions Sponsored			Contact Sessions Attended		
	Sum of Days	Mean Number of Days	Number of Responses	Sum of Days	Mean Number of Days	Number of Responses
Sept. 1/81-Jan.31/82	352	6.07	56	363	5.85	62
Sept. 1/81-June 30/82	90	6.43	14	99	6.18	16
Jan. 31/81-June 30/82	9	2.25	4	9	2.25	4
	451	5.93	76	471	2.25	82

Table 36 presents an analysis of resource teacher rating of contact sessions by zone. Of the total sample of resource teachers, 85.5% rated the contact sessions as Satisfactory (56.6%) or Very Satisfactory (28.9%). Furthermore, in Zone 4, 100% of the resource teachers rated the contact sessions as Satisfactory (42.9%) or Very Satisfactory (57.1%).

Table 36

Resource Teacher Rating of Contact Sessions By Zone

Rating reported in percentage (n = 83)	Zone					Total Sample
	1	2&3	4	5	6	
Very Unsatisfactory	0	2.2	0	0	0	1.2%
Unsatisfactory	16.7	2.2	0	0	0	2.4%
Neutral	0	6.5	0	18.2	30.8	10.8%
Satisfactory	16.7	69.6	42.9	54.5	38.5	56.6%
Very Satisfactory	66.7	19.6	57.1	27.3	30.8	28.9%

Table 37 presents an analysis of resource teachers' ratings of contact sessions by term of appointment. Of the total sample of resource teachers, 86.6% rated the contact session as Satisfactory (57.3%) or Very Satisfactory (29.3%). The data showed that 100% of the resource teachers who were appointed from Jan 31/82 to June 30/82, rated the contact sessions as Satisfactory (75%) or Very Satisfactory (25%).

Table 37

Resource Teacher Rating of Contact Sessions By Term of Appointment

Rating reported in percentage (n = 83)	Sept 1/81- Jan. 31/82	Sept. 1/82- June 30/82	Jan. 31/82 June 30/82	Total Sample
Very Unsatisfactory	0.0	6.3	0	1.2%
Unsatisfactory	1.6	6.3	0	2.4%
Neutral	6.5	25.0	0	9.8%
Satisfactory	58.1	50.0	75	57.3%
Very Satisfactory	33.9	12.5	25	29.3%

Responses to question 4(a) reveal that 71 of the 85 resource teachers contacted Alberta Education at least once during their terms as resource teachers. Responses to question 4(b) reveal that the mean number of contacts was 6.231. Although these contacts ranged from once to 50 times, 80% of the resource teachers contacted Alberta Education 1 to 6 times.

Resource teachers rated their interaction with Alberta Education on a Likert-type scale from Very Satisfactory (5) to Very Unsatisfactory (1). Their mean rating was 4.538, indicating a very high degree of satisfaction with these contacts. An analysis of this same rating by zone appears in Table 38.

Table 38

Resource Teacher Rating of Contact
With Alberta Education by Zone

Rating reported in percentage (n = 78)	Zone					Sample Total
	1	2&3	4	5	6	
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	9.1	0	1.3
Neutral	0	4.5	0	18.2	0	5.1
Satisfactory	60.0	40.9	16.7	0.0	25.0	32.1
Very Satisfactory	40.0	54.5	83.3	72.7	75.0	61.5

A further analysis was done by term of appointment. While the rating was high in all terms, the highest percentage of resource teachers rating their interaction with Alberta Education as unsatisfactory (6.3%) or neutral (12.5%) occurred in the term of appointment from September 1/81 to June 30/82. The results appear in Table 39.

Table 39

Resource Teacher Rating of Contact
With Alberta Education by Term of Appointment

Rating reported in percentage (n = 78)	Sept 1/81- Jan. 31/82	Sept. 1/82- June 30/82	Jan. 31/82 June 30/82	Sample Total
Unsatisfactory	0.0	6.3	0	4.5
Neutral	3.5	12.5	0	9.1
Satisfactory	35.1	25.0	25	27.3
Very Satisfactory	61.4	56.3	75	59.1

The data reported above show that:

1. A substantial number of days were devoted to contact sessions (Table 34).
2. On the average, each teacher attended six contact sessions between the beginning of the project and January 31, 1982 (Table 35).
3. Resource teachers generally rated the contact sessions positively, but there were some low ratings (Tables 36 to 39).
4. Resource teachers were generally positive about their contacts with Alberta Education (Tables 38 and 39).

In Tables 40 and 41, the responses to a question about the nature of the assignment of resource teachers are provided. The question was, "How would you rate the organizational assignment of resource teacher positions throughout Alberta?" The meaning of the term "organizational assignment" in the question was intended to be the allocation of resource teacher positions throughout the province. However it is possible that some resource teachers may not have been aware of the assignment in other parts of the province and they may have rated the organizational assignment in their own zone.

Table 40

Rating of Organizational Assignment by Resource Teachers

Category Label (n = 85)	Number	Percentage
Very Unsatisfactory	1	1
Unsatisfactory	10	11
Neutral	14	16
Satisfactory	40	47
Very Satisfactory	10	11
Missing Cases	10	11

Table 41

Rating of Organizational Assignment By Zone

Category Label (n = 85)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Total Sample Percentage
	(Rating given in percentage)					
Very Unsatisfactory	0	1.3	0	0	0	1.3
Unsatisfactory	1.3	8.0	0	2.7	1.3	13.3
Neutral	1.3	8.0	1.3	5.3	2.7	18.7
Satisfactory	2.7	32.0	5.3	5.3	8.0	53.3
Very Satisfactory	2.7	4.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	13.3

The data show a generally positive opinion about the assignment organization within each zone and throughout the province. However, as noted previously, the results should be treated with caution since the question asked to obtain the data was open to differing interpretations.

In Table 42 the results of the analysis of data on the value of the project are provided.

Table 42

Resource Teacher Rating of Teacher Attitudes
Toward 1981 Social Studies In-Service Project

Category Label (n = 85)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Total Sample Percentage
	(Rating given in percentage)					
Very Negative	0	1.2	0	0	0	1.2
Negative	0	2.4	0	1.2	1.2	4.7
Neutral	0	4.7	0	0	2.4	7.1
Positive	7.1	29.4	4.7	9.4	7.1	57.6
Very Positive	0	16.5	3.5	3.5	5.9	29.4

These results can be summarized as follows: resource teachers gave a generally positive rating of the attitudes of teachers towards the in-service project. The results of the content analysis of five open-ended questions are provided in some detail in Tables 59 to 63 (Appendix C). The results are summarized as follows:

1. Resource teachers reported the following as positive aspects of the project: teacher interaction and sharing; increased teacher awareness, understanding and knowledge of the 1981 social studies curriculum; awareness of resource materials; and the peer-based consulting model.
2. Negative aspects of the project as seen by resource teachers included: insufficient time, inadequate training of resource teachers, absence of a follow-up to this project, and the "too-theoretical nature of the mentor series".
3. Among changes suggested by the resource teachers for a future version of the project were: more and better training of resource teachers, extension of the project, and having resource materials available before the project starts.
4. Personal benefits accruing to the resource teachers included: the opportunity to meet and work with other professionals, increased knowledge and understanding of the social studies curriculum, increased personal and professional skills, improved teaching skills, and potential in career advancement. (Incidentally, only nine teachers reported a "change of pace" as one of the personal benefits).
5. Personal losses suffered by resource teachers included: the work load, lost contact with own pupils and uncompensated costs.

A final item on the resource teacher questionnaire asked for an overall rating of the in-service project. As shown in Table 45, 98.7% of the resource teachers who completed the questionnaire rated the project as satisfactory or very satisfactory.

Table 43

Overall Rating of In-Service Project

Category Label (n = 84)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Total Sample Percentage
	(Ratings given in percentages)					
Very Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unsatisfactory	0	1	0	0	0	1
Neutral	0	10	0	0	1	11
Satisfactory	7	32	5	8	10	62
Very Satisfactory	0	12	4	7	7	26

Discussion of results. The results reported above are, in the opinion of the evaluators, quite significant especially in terms of possible future projects with similar goals.

There was substantial evidence that the resource teachers had a positive opinion about the project itself and its general effects upon them. A corps of hard-working and enthusiastic people were involved with the project and they seemed to come out of the project with high morale. On a less positive note, there were indications that the mentor series required major adaptation and revision before it could be used and that some of the modules were not extensively used. The suggestion by a number of resource teachers that such materials be fully developed and refined before projects begin has implications for planners of similar projects.

Interviews of Resource Teachers

Interviews, using the schedule provided in Appendix A, were conducted with 30 of the resource teachers. The responses were analyzed using the content analysis methods described earlier in this report. The results of these interviews are provided in detail in Appendix C. The five questions asked in the interviews were:

1. What is your general opinion about the in-service project?
2. What effects did the project have on you?
3. What were the "high points" of your involvement in the project?
4. Did you encounter any problems during the in-service project? (If so, what were they?)
5. What changes would you suggest be made in any future projects of the same type?

The results can be summarized as follows:

1. Resource teachers had a generally positive opinion about the project and its effects on them.
2. Personal growth, new experiences, professional growth and increased expertise and knowledge were reported as outcomes.
3. High points in the project included: opportunites to meet and work with other people such as colleagues, other resource teachers, Alberta Education Consultants, regional office consultants and local administrators; workshops; and a break from the classroom.
4. Problems identified in the interviews included: time pressures, passive resistance by some teachers, and the content of some of the Kanata kits.
5. Changes were suggested in the time allocated to planning, implementing and operating any future similar project; selection and training of resource teachers; and having resource materials available earlier.

Discussion of results. The main points to be noted here are: (1) the one-to-one interview data essentially corroborated the questionnaire data reported earlier, and (2) the interview provided a final opportunity for the evaluators to have direct, personal contact with the key people in the project. Therefore, it was possible for the evaluators to add further meaning to some of the "impersonal" data obtained by other means.

Resource Teacher Log Books

The log books which were used by all of the resource teachers were seen by the evaluators as a potentially rich source of fairly unobtrusive data on the projects. A sample of 30 books was randomly selected and their contents were

analyzed again using the content analysis methods described elsewhere. The detailed results are provided in Table 69 (Appendix C). To sum up, the following can be said:

1. Resource teachers used a wide variety of activities and patterns of organization to help achieve project objectives.
2. The data from the log books indicated that the resource teachers had made good use of the time assigned to them and that the job turned out to be a very demanding one.

Discussion of results. Perhaps the major comment to be made here is that the log books provided data which was highly corroborative of other data obtained by the evaluators and, therefore, this analysis was justified from a research methodology standpoint. The possible side effects upon the resource teachers of being asked to keep a log book would perhaps merit study at some future time.

Workshop Observations

A sample of 29 workshops was selected for observation by members of the evaluation team. Observers were asked to make judgements on a 5-point scale regarding the six factors listed below in Table 44. The factors were identified after a brief review of the literature on teacher effectiveness and adult learning.

Table 44

Workshop Observation

Factor	Average Rating
1. Climate	3.97
2. Clarity	3.88
3. Organization	3.97
4. Degree of teacher participation	3.62
5. Degree to which teacher needs were meet	3.59
6. Extent to which objectives were achieved	3.79

The results show that the ratings were consistently above 3.5 and, therefore, can be described as positive. Only two of the 29 workshops received a rating of 1.0 on climate, two were rated 1.0 on clarity, and one was rated 1.0 on teacher participation.

Discussion of results. The workshop observations yielded positive results. The possible obtrusiveness of the evaluators and the high cost of obtaining the data may suggest that such procedures be assigned a low priority in future studies of this kind.

Stakeholder Opinions about the Project

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was distributed to a sample of "stakeholders". Of the 97 returned, 38 had been completed by principals, 27 by superintendents, 22 by deputy superintendents, four by consultants, one by an assistant principal, and one by a trustee; four respondents did not identify their position.

The results of the content analysis of three open-ended questions are presented in detail in Tables 70, 71 and 72 (Appendix C). The data provided there suggest the following:

1. Stakeholders identified as positive effects such things as: greater teacher awareness and familiarity with the 1981 social studies curriculum and resource materials, increased understanding and knowledge of the social studies curriculum, greater variation in teaching techniques and strategies, the exchange of ideas and materials, and the peer-based consultative model.
2. Among negative effects the following were identified: disruption of classes, extra costs, and creation of expectations for future, similar projects.
3. Changes suggested by the stakeholders included: changes in scheduling and time allocations, more "practical" content for in-service sessions, more lead time, and extension of the project.

In Table 45 the responses to three questions are provided. The respondents were requested to rate three variables using a 5-point Likert-type scale (5 being the highest rating and 1 being the lowest rating).

Table 45

Stakeholder Ratings

Question (n = 97)	Average Rating
1. Generally, how would you rate the attitudes of the teachers toward the 1981 social studies curriculum?	3.67
2. Generally, how would you rate the attitudes of the teachers in your jurisdiction toward the Social Studies In-Service Project?	3.88
3. Overall, how would you rate the value of the Social Studies In-Service Project for teachers?	3.94

These data show that there was a positive rating of:

1. The attitudes of teachers towards the 1981 social studies curriculum.
2. The attitudes of teachers towards the In-Service Project.
3. The value of the project for teachers.

Discussion of results. Although the data from the stakeholder group are reported rather briefly in this section, their importance must not be underestimated. A group of professionals close to the project but independent of it have provided data which is positive and corroborative of other data obtained by other methods.

Stakeholder Interviews

Personal interviews were conducted with 20 stakeholders, and focussed group interviews were conducted with approximately 100 stakeholders. The results are presented in Appendix E. The content analysis revealed generally positive opinions about the contributions of the resource teachers, the value of the project and the benefits to teachers. Negative comments were made about time (for planning and implementation), and resource materials. Changes were suggested in time allocation, clearer definition of resource teacher roles, and in the nature of the workshops.

Case Studies of Selected Jurisdictions

A number of jurisdictions were selected for special study in an attempt to obtain answers to evaluation questions regarding differing "models" of implementation. The jurisdictions were identified by members of the Evaluation Steering Committee as "interesting" variations on the main themes of the project and do not, therefore, constitute a random representative sample of jurisdictions.

County of Barrhead #11. The County of Barrhead did not participate in the Social Studies In-Service Project. Although they did nominate a representative for the resource teacher position in June of 1981, this was the extent of their participation. It was also at that time that the county presented a case to Alberta Education for approval to adopt the In-Service Project as it had been proposed. The county explained that they had a position designated as a curriculum co-ordinator. The appointment was for a year and it was to be filled by one of the local teachers. The annual appointment allowed the county, among other things, to focus on different subject areas.

It was during the 1980-81 school term that the county had chosen to focus on social studies. One of the local teachers was seconded and he spent the entire year in-servicing the social studies teachers in the County of Barrhead. During the 1981-82 school term, which was the year of the Social Studies In-Service Project, the curriculum coordinator (who was a different teacher) focused on mathematics and science in-servicing. Social studies in-servicing during this year was assigned to the deputy superintendent.

Therefore, the County of Barrhead requested that the social studies in-service monies from Alberta Education be issued to them in the form of a grant to offset the costs of implementation in the mathematics-science areas. This was communicated to three individuals in Alberta Education, the last one being the Minister of Education. In March of 1982, the Minister denied the request.

Brooks School District #2092

In late June of 1981, Brooks School District communicated to Alberta Education two proposals for implementing the Social Studies In-Service Project

in that jurisdiction. The rationale for not accepting the Alberta Education model was given. One of the proposals was accepted by Alberta Education.

The most unique feature of the Brooks Social Studies In-Service Project was that (1/2 of a 0.5) resource teacher position was shared by six teachers. Each one of these six resource teachers was responsible for inserving the social studies teachers in his/her own school. Therefore, the resource teachers were school-based.

An extensive amount of data were collected in the Brooks School District. The evaluation team interviewed the superintendent, deputy superintendent and some of the resource teachers. Focused group interviews were held with all the social studies teachers in elementary, junior and senior high schools, and all the principals. In addition, appropriate questionnaires were completed by all who are listed above.

An analysis of the results showed that the implementation of the Social Studies In-Service Project in Brooks was satisfactory and of high value for the classroom teachers. The high school teachers rated the project of less value than did the elementary or junior high teachers.

Some of the positive comments about the project were the direct result of having resource teachers located in each of the schools. The resource teachers were frequently described as being knowledgeable and also available.

The comments about the negative aspects included the short lead-time for the project and also the short time of the project. The 1981 social studies curriculum was also criticized for being too process oriented and, likewise, the inquiry process itself was criticized. Two of the changes that were mentioned followed directly from the negative aspects; that is, that more lead time is required and that the project should continue longer. In addition, administrators and resource teachers noted that resource teachers should be given time away from classroom duties to prepare for the workshops.

The adaptations that were made to the Social Studies In-Service Project in this jurisdiction yielded overall successful results. The model that was locally developed fulfilled the needs of the jurisdiction and was within the guidelines proposed by Alberta Education.

Calgary Public School Board #19. In order to implement the Social Studies In-Service Project in Calgary Public School Board #19, there was a great deal of communication and discussion among the departments involved. The project was planned so it would comply with the directions developed by Alberta Education, mesh with the existing organizatonal structures in Calgary Public School Board and at the same time meet the needs of the organization. Eight full-time teachers were seconded for the full school year and one full-time teacher was seconded for half the school year. These teachers were given the title of resource teachers and they were added to the social studies team. The social studies team, previous to the project, consisted of six positions: one supervisor, one specialist, one secondary consultant, two elementary consultants and one secretary. The new revised social studies team was responsible for the planning and implementation of the Social Studies In-Service Project for the Calgary Public School Board. For example, both the consultants and resource teachers were involved in planning and delivering the workshops.

Another unique feature of the Calgary Public School Board implementation plan was the extensive needs assessment which was conducted in the early stages of the project. It was hoped that individual schools would be responsible for deciding on the agenda for the in-servicing activities, thereby selecting that which would best meet their needs. The social studies team was made available for consultation. Principals were requested to complete a needs assessment questionnaire in consultation with their staff and to forward the completed needs assessment to the social studies team. This information was used in planning the workshops.

The data used in assessing the Calgary Public School Board's implementation plan of the Social Studies In-Service Project was collected by a variety of sources. A very comprehensive assessment was carried out by the resource teachers themselves. During May and June they distributed questionnaires, analyzed them and compiled the results into grade level reports. Data were also collected by the evaluators through classroom teacher surveys, resource teacher questionnaires and interviews, and administrator/ consultant questionnaires and/or surveys.

When the data from the classroom teachers in Calgary Public School Board were analyzed, the results showed that the Social Studies In-Service Project was rated positively. On a 5-point scale (1 being Not Helpful At All and 5 being Extremely Helpful) the mean rating for the helpfulness of the Social Studies In-Service Project as reported by 210 classroom teachers was 3.4. The mean rating for the 210 classroom teachers' attitude toward the Social Studies In-Service Project was 3.6 on the 5-point scale. Furthermore, when the classroom teachers were asked to report if their knowledge and understanding of the 1981 social studies curriculum have improved as a result of the In-Service Project a range of 75% to 92% (over the four divisions with social studies specialist teachers and non-social studies specialists) reported "Yes". From 66% to 97% of the same group of teachers reported that the Social Studies In-Service Project had assisted them in teaching social studies. Finally, 16 of the 210 teachers surveyed reported that they had participated in less than two days of inservice.

All resource teachers who responded (four out of nine), rated the value of the Social Studies In-Service Project for teachers in the Calgary Public School Board as High or Very High. They all rated the Social Studies In-Service Project, overall, as Very Satisfactory. Furthermore, the resource teachers reported that they had delivered two days of inservice activities to all but three of 150 elementary schools. (Three schools did not participate in the second day of in-service.)

Although the Calgary Public School Board implementation plan of the Social Studies In-Service Project was rated positively, several changes were suggested for consideration. The changes identified by various respondents included: more lead-time to be given by Alberta Education, more time for the project (two years), curriculum materials made available at least one month prior to in-servicing, more continuity (province-wide) regarding the responsibilities of resource teachers, better training for resource teachers, allowance for increased resource teacher input in the initial stages of the implementation process, and continued emphasis on grade-specific, multi-school workshops.

The Social Studies In-Service Project plan which was implemented by the Calgary Public School Board allowed the project to fit into the existing organizational structure while complying with the plan proposed by Alberta

Education. Although changes for the plan were suggested, overall it was a successful one for that jurisdiction. One of the major factors that influenced the success of the project was the outstanding cooperation shown by all those involved in the project.

Consortium (South Central Alberta). The resource teacher in this position was responsible for a consortium which consisted of Drumheller Valley S.D. #62, St. Anthony's R.C.S.S.D. #24, Starland S.D. #30, Rangeland S.D. #9, Berry Creek S.D., Acadia Valley S.D. #8, and Assumption R.C.S.S.D. #50. The resource teacher was given a full-time position from September 1, 1981 to June 20, 1982.

One of the early tasks of the resource teacher was to distribute a needs assessment survey to the teachers. Following the analysis of the results of the needs assessment, a decision was made to divide the consortium into West and East for grade level workshops. The focus of the first day of in-servicing (the fall workshops) was on planning units using the resource materials and curriculum guide.

In February, the resource teacher distributed a Spring Workshop Survey to all social studies teachers. The results of this survey were used for planning the second day of in-servicing (the spring workshops). The workshops were by grade level for grades one through six and by division level (junior and senior) for grades seven through twelve. The results of the survey determined that the focusses of the workshops be "values" and "evaluation".

In total, the resource teacher delivered 30 days of workshops which included workshops for teachers, administrators and librarians. The comments of the workshop participants were positive and generally appreciative.

In addition, the resource teacher spent approximately 58 days, or three months, doing peer-based consulting during classroom visitations. Some of the sessions had been requested by classroom teachers and others were at the request of the resource teacher. All of the sessions were informal and most teachers felt comfortable during the sessions.

The resource teacher also delivered presentations to two parent groups and three school boards. These presentations were generally well received and generally increased the participants' knowledge and understanding of social studies. In addition to the activities described above, the resource teacher

compiled a media catalogue which was organized by grade level and topic. It was very well received by the teachers. In this catalogue, the resource teacher recommended that social studies teachers rely more on videotapes than on films and that the videotapes be distributed by S.C.A.F.F. for ACCESS.

One of the last tasks of the resource teacher was to distribute a questionnaire to social studies teachers in May. The purpose of the questionnaire was to give the teachers the opportunity to evaluate the Social Studies In-Service Project. The results of the survey were extremely positive. Two noteworthy examples are: 99% of the teachers reported that their knowledge and understanding of the 1981 social studies curriculum had improved as a result of the In-Service Project and 92% of the teachers reported that in-service activities had assisted them in teaching social studies.

The resource teacher rated the In-Service Project as very satisfactory and as having very high value for the social studies teachers. However, some concerns were noted. One of the concerns was that "elementary teachers were still somewhat concerned over values in the curriculum." Another concern was that "classloads for teachers are too large." There was concern about the future in-service for teachers who are new to the province or new to social studies. It was also noted that resource teachers should have a definite description of their responsibilities in their respective jurisdictions, after their term as resource teacher has expired. This consortium arrangement yielded very positive results for its participants.

Edmonton Public #7. In early June, 1981, the superintendent of Edmonton Public School District #7 communicated a proposed implementation plan for the Social Studies In-Service Project to the board of trustees. The originator of the plan was the associate superintendent of instructional services and the resource persons were the assistant superintendent of curriculum and the supervisor of social studies. The funding for the implementation of the Social Studies In-Service Project came from Alberta Education, Decison Unit 679 and the Educational Opportunities Fund Implementation Project. The result was that all schools received an allocation of $60 per social studies teacher to support the implementation of the Social Studies In-Service Project.

One of the unique features of the Edmonton Public School implementation plan was that the implementation of the 1981 social studies curriculum was "the responsibility of the school principal with assistance available from Social Studies Services". In a memo to administrators, it was recommended "that principals define objectives and develop an implementation plan which will include professional development days, school professional development days as well as district in-service and intervisitation. . . . It is recommended that the school implementation plan include a minimum of two days (or equivalent) professional experience per teacher".

Thirteen resource teachers on a 0.5 full-time equivalent basis were seconded to assist district staff with the social studies implementation. These teachers were given the designation of consultant and, therefore, were referred to by this title in any correspondence. They were also classified as consultants for salary purposes.

The responsibilities of the resource teachers were clearly defined by the supervisor of social studies at the beginning of the project. The 182 schools in the district were divided among the resource teachers. The resource teachers were responsible for making initial contacts with the principals of the schools and holding one-on-one reviews with the principals to clarify the purpose of the project and their participation in it. In addition each resource teacher was assigned the following: a grade level or levels, an orientation session or sessions, certain district professional development days, two mentor modules, one social studies topic B, one social studies topic C and grade level displays in particular locations. The services of the resource teachers which were listed as available were as follows: orientation for 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum, mentor series in-service package, material and resources supporting each of the 34 prescribed topics and other topics (on request). Consultation was also listed under services. It included the following: grade level planning/overview, and identificaton/ selection of resources. Four other services were listed under consultation, but it was noted that these would be available to individual classroom teachers if time permitted. These services were as follows: facilitate peer teaching/intervisitation, demonstration lessons, coaching and feedback, and split grade planning. A very detailed compilation of the resource teachers'

activities for the year was developed and communicated to principals through a number of different channels.

The supervisor of social studies monitored the implementation of the Social Studies In-Service Project; however accountability for results was clearly the responsiblity of the school principal. A research team from the University of Alberta assessed the project using a sample of 24 elementary schools. The analysis of the results from the classroom teacher survey, distributed as a data source for the evaluation presented in this report, showed that the social studies teachers in Edmonton Public School District rated the Social Studies In-Service Project positively. For example, when rating how helpful the In-Service Project was on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being Not Helpful At All and 5 being Extremely Helpful) the mean rating of 234 teachers was 3.2. Likewise, when requested to rate their attitude toward the Social Studies In-Service Project on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being Very Unfavourable and 5 being Very Favourable), the mean rating of 233 teachers was 3.3. However, 60.5% (141 out of 233) reported that they had received less than two days of social studies in-service. Data that were collected by the social studies supervisor reflected participation by teachers that was over and above the two day requirement.

The resource teacher questionnaire, completed by 11 out of 17 teachers, was a further source of data for this evaluation report. The analysis of the results from the questionnaires showed that the resource teachers rated the project positively. For example, all resource teachers rated the In-Service Project, overall, as Very Satisfactory or Satisfactory. The resource teachers also rated the value of the Social Studies In-Service Project for teachers as either Very High or High. Furthermore, all of the resource teachers reported that they had delivered two days of in-servicing for classroom teachers.

Some of the changes identified for consideration in future implementation plans were the following: more lead-time by Alberta Education, increased length of time for the project, elimination of half-time teaching and half-time resource teacher assignments, improved training of resource teachers, having materials available before in-service begins and allowing for resource teacher input into the implementation plan.

The plan for the Social Studies In-Service Project which was implemented by Edmonton Public School District complied with the plan of Alberta Education and with its own organizational structure of school-based budgeting with the exception of the number of days of in-service. As mentioned earlier, a large percentage (60.5%) of the classroom teachers who were surveyed reported that they had received less than two days of social studies in-service.

Medicine Hat School District #76. In Medicine Hat School District #76 the resource teacher acted mainly as a liaison person providing the district with information. The resource teacher term was only for approximately 20 days. During these days the resource teacher's activities included the following: delivering workshops, peer-based consulting, preparing materials, and meeting with principals, supervisors and trustees. The reason for the limited resource teacher position in Medicine Hat School District was that there had been an intensive social studies in-servicing program in that jurisdiction the year previous. Therefore, the regional consultant, in consultation with the superintendent and the director of curriculum and instruction, decided to limit the resource teacher position.

The major recommendations for the Social Studies In-Service Project suggested by those in this jurisdiction was that the timing of the project be changed. They stated that in-servicing of teachers should have preceded the mandatory implementation of the curriculum; "in-servicing cannot come the same year that the curriculum is mandatory."

Summary Results of Case Studies

The following tentative generalizations from the case studies seem possible:

1. The project enabled jurisdictions to use different organizational and delivery strategies while usually complying with the guidelines. (See the letters dated May 7/83 and June 3/83 from the Associate Deputy Minister in Appendix A.)
2. Although there was variation, there were many more similarities than differences between and among the local jurisdictions.

Discussion of the results. The external evaluators are of the opinion that if Alberta Education wishes to have various alternative models tested in a natural experiment it should consider using some version of a "planned variation" approach that would require project developers and planners to identify significantly different (from one another) models and then to negotiate with school jurisdictions in order to have a local "sponsor" for each of the alternatives. Careful monitoring to ensure that the models are indeed implemented according to specifications and that collection of process, product and cost data would provide useful information. When one trusts to somewhat ad hoc or accidental variation, one loses the opportunity to conduct comparison studies of dissemination and innovation.

CONCLUSIONS

The results reported in the previous section of this report led to a number of conclusions. These are presented in two sections: (1) conclusions about the evaluation questions, and (2) conclusions about the project objectives.

Conclusions about the Evaluation Questions

In Section 1.0 of this report seven evaluation questions were identified. Conclusions with respect to these questions are presented below.

Q.1. What effect does the in-service project have upon the knowledge of participating teachers?

Based on the results of pre- and post-test data, the classroom teacher survey, the teachers' pre- and post-interviews, the estimates of the resource teachers and the stakeholders, the conclusion is that:

1. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT HAD A VERY DEFINITE POSITIVE EFFECT UPON THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PARTICIPATING TEACHERS.

Q.2. What effect does the in-service project have upon the attitude of participating teachers?

Based on the same findings used to draw the first conclusion (above) the evaluators conclude that:

2. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT HAD A VERY DEFINITE POSITIVE EFFECT UPON THE ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS.

Q.3. What models for in-service were used?

The resource teacher log books, interviews with resource teachers and stakeholders, the case studies and the workshop observation records indicate that although there were many interesting local arrangements, no definite "models" in any significant sense of that word were employed. Therefore, on this evaluation question the conclusion is that:

3. WHILE INTERESTING VARIATIONS IN SOME ASPECTS OF LOCAL OR REGIONAL OPERATIONS WERE FOUND, THE DIFFERENCES WERE NOT SUBSTANTIAL ENOUGH TO SUGGEST THAT CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE "MODELS" HAD BEEN USED.

Q.4. Which "models" were most effective?

Given the conclusion regarding question 3 (above), the conclusion here is that:

4. NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE WAS AVAILABLE TO ENABLE THE EVALUATORS TO DRAW A CONCLUSION ON THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION.

Q.5. What side effects did the project have?

All of the data sources combined to indicate highly positive side effects upon resource teachers and participating teachers. There were some neutral and/or negative aspects mentioned as well. The negative aspects that were most frequently mentioned in the data were: insufficient lead-time for the project; insufficient time for the project, no follow-up activities for the project, inadequate training of resource teachers, unavailability of project resource materials, disruption of classroom learning and the cost of the project. The conclusion, therefore, is that:

5. THE PROJECT HAD A LARGE NUMBER OF SIDE EFFECTS. THESE WERE MAINLY POSITIVE; BUT THERE WERE SOME NEGATIVE ASPECTS AS WELL.

Q.6. How well was the process of planned dissemination carried out?

The data show clearly that the project was implemented and carried through to a successful conclusion even though the time-line for planning and the early stages of implementation was quite short. In the opinion of the evaluators, the apparent willingness of Alberta Education to permit (or even encourage) local variations within the general guidelines was mainly positive

in its effects. However, there was no evidence in our data that the notion of "models" received any more than fleeting consideration during the planning of the project. It seemed that variation was expected, permitted, perhaps even hoped for; but that no deliberate plans were laid to capitalize on an opportunity to experiment in any serious way with alternative delivery systems. Our conclusion on this sixth question is therefore mixed in the sense that while the project was carried out successfully, the compressed time-line for planning and other possible factors on which we have no particular data militated against development of a more sophisticated plan. Our conclusion on this question is that:

6. THE PROCESS OF DISSEMINATION WAS CARRIED OUT QUITE SUCCESSFULLY. HOWEVER THE PROJECT, PROBABLY BECAUSE OF THE SHORT LEAD-TIME AVAILABLE FOR DETAILED PLANNING, WAS NOT ABLE TO TEST ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATION.

Q.7. What were the factors or contextual variables which had an effect upon the dissemination and adoption process?

At the provincial level, the success which the project generally enjoyed seems to be attributable to the cooperation of a number of groups and agencies which have been involved with the in-service question for some time. While Alberta Education had the major input, the support of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, and the participating school jurisdictions was crucial for this project. As a cooperative effort, therefore, it is somewhat unique on the North American scene. At the local and regional level, the simplest and, we believe, the most striking comment is that the dedicated work of highly competent professionals including the resource teachers, regional office consultants, and local district and school administrators made for a successful project. If the notion of a "multiplier effect" makes any sense in this context, it was evident that Alberta Education and the other participating agencies obtained very positive effects for their in-service investment. The conclusions are that:

7a. AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL, THE MAJOR INPUTS BY ALBERTA EDUCATION AND THE COOPERATION OF OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS PROVIDED BOTH THE CLIMATE OF SUPPORT AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATON.

7b. AT THE LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL, THE IMPORTANT FACTORS WERE THE PROFESSIONALISM AND COMPETENCE OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

Conclusions about the Project Objectives

The objectives of the Social Studies In-Service Project were presented in the Introduction to this evaluation report. Conclusions regarding the objectives are presented below.

Objective 1 (For Alberta Teachers)

(a) to ensure that all social studies teachers in Alberta have a working understanding of the characteristics and requirements of the 1981 social studies curriculum;

(b) to provide all social studies teachers in Alberta with opportunities to broaden their repertoire of instructional strategies for social studies.

On the basis of the findings reported above, our conclusion is that:

8a. MOST SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN ALBERTA HAVE AN ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE 1981 SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM.

8b. MOST SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN ALBERTA HAVE BEEN ABLE TO BROADEN THEIR REPERTOIRE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Objective 2 (For Alberta Social Studies)

(a) to ensure that the 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum, which has been the subject of considerable public and professional interest, is given a fair chance for successful implementation;

(b) to provide a means for heightened professional and public dialogue about issues pertaining to social studies philosophy and methodology in Alberta.

Our conclusions with respect to the second set of objectives are that:

9a. THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT PROVIDES A STRONG BASE FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1981 CURRICULUM.

9b. THE PROJECT LED TO HEIGHTENED PROFESSIONAL DIALOGUE. THE OBJECTIVE OF INCREASED PUBLIC DIALOGUE WAS, ESSENTIALLY, MINIMALLY ADDRESSED BY THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT.

Objective 3 (For Curriculum Implementation in Alberta)

- to test the viability of a peer-based consultative approach to curriculum implementation in Alberta schools.

Our conclusion is that:

10. THE IN-SERVICE PROJECT SOLIDLY CONFIRMED THE VIABILITY OF A PEER-BASED CONSULTATIVE APPROACH.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The external evaluators have the following recommendations to make to Alberta Education. These recommendations are, in the main, intended to assist policy-makers considering possible future projects with goals similar to this one.

1. INCREASED LEAD-TIME SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

Increased lead-time was a change that was repeatedly mentioned in the data of this study. Local school jurisdications noted that increased lead-time is necessary in order that they have the opportunity to make appropriate decisions for planning the implementation of in-service projects. Furthermore, they stressed that financial information must be provided early enough so it can be included in local budget discussions.

In the opinion of the external evaluators the timing of the Minister's announcement of the project did not provide Alberta Education staff with the time needed to establish effective two-way communication with various agencies (Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, etc.) at the provincial level or with local school jurisdictions before launching the project.

Increased lead-time could also be used for developing detailed plans which would pay greater attention to selection and training of resource teachers than was possible in the Social Studies In-Service Project. Moreover, the curriculum and instructional materials needed for the typical in-service project could be developed, field-tested and better readied for delivery.

2. COOPERATION BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE THE BASIC STRATEGY FOR IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

The success of this project was traceable, in part, to cooperation among a number of parties. This approach will continue to be the most viable one for future projects in other subject areas.

3. SOME TYPE OF FORMAL FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE PART OF THE PLAN FOR IN-SERVICE PROJECTS.

Comment

It is clear in the findings of this study that follow-up work is needed. There will likely be a variety of follow-up activities in some jurisdictions but full capitalization upon the investment in similar projects would seem to require a deliberately planned set of follow-up activities by Alberta Education to ensure that the momentum developed at local and regional levels during the project is maintained.

Indeed, given the results of this project, Alberta Education might begin developing policies which would lead to the implementation of in-service projects in other subject areas. The development of such policies would serve to direct and coordinate all future in-service activities for the department, thereby providing necessary information which would allow local school jurisdictions to engage in long range planning procedures.

4. THE PEER-BASED CONSULTATIVE APPROACH SHOULD BE STRONGLY CONSIDERED AS AN APPROACH IN FUTURE PROJECTS.

Comment

The sheer demands of numbers of people required for such projects suggests that there is no other practical approach to implementing province-wide projects of this type. Moreover, the high level of acceptance accorded the resource teachers in the Social Studies In-Service Project indicates that this is an important characteristic of a well-designed project.

5. AN EVALUATION COMPONENT SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE REQUIRED IN FUTURE PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE.

Comment

While such a recommendation from an external evaluator may appear to be self-serving, it is reasonably clear to us that the evaluation component, however demanding on project personnel, is quite necessary from both an accountability and quality standpoint. Furthermore, data from such an evaluation component serves as formative information for future projects.

APPENDIX A

RESPONSES TO RESOURCE TEACHER PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE

Tables 46 - 58

Table 46

Distribution of Resource Teachers by Zone

Zone	Number	Percentage
1	10	9.3
2&3	52	48.6
4	14	13.1
5	18	16.8
6	13	12.1
Total	107	100.0

Table 47

Sex Distribution of Resource Teachers by Zone

Sex	Zone					Number	Total Sample Percentage
	1	2&3	4	5	6		
Female	2	19	7	6	4	38	35.5%
Male	8	33	7	12	9	69	64.5%
						107	100.0%

Table 48

Grade Levels of Social Studies Taught

	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	All Elem.	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Grades 7-12	All Grades	Sample Total
Resource Teachers	14	30	10	30	18	24	4	130
Percentage	10.8	23.1	7.7	23.1	13.8	3.1	18.5	100%

Table 49

Other Teaching Experience in Number of Years

(n = 88)	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	All Elem.	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Grades 7-12	All Grades	Sample Total
Number of Years	3	5	4	3	2	4	0	21

Table 50

Degrees Held by Resource Teachers

(n = 107)	No Deg.	B.A.	B.Sc.	B.Ed.	M.A.	M.Sc.	M.Ed.	Ph.D. Ed.D.	Other Degree	Sample Total
Frequency	2	30	8	85	2	1	15	0	17	160

Table 51

Degrees Held by Resource Teachers by Zone

(n = 107)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Sample Total
No Degree	0	0	1	0	1	1.9%
B.A.	6	10	2	8	4	28.0%
B.Sc.	1	4	0	2	1	7.5%
B.Ed.	7	44	12	14	8	79.4%
M.A.	0	2	0	0	0	1.9%
M.Ed.	1	9	2	3	0	14.0%
Other Degrees	0	13	0	4	0	15.9%
Totals	15	83	17	31	14	100.0%

Table 52

Major and Minor Areas of Study

	Major				Minor			
	Eng.	Hist.	S.S.	Other	Eng.	Hist.	S.S.	Other
Frequency of Report	5	25	39	47	8	13	6	68
Percentage	5.0	24.8	38.6	46.5	8.6	14.0	6.5	73.1

Table 53

Areas of Study by Zone

	Zone				
	1	2&3	4	5	6
Major (n= 101)					
English	0	4	0	1	0
History	2	12	2	6	3
Social Studies	3	21	8	3	4
Other	6	18	4	14	5
Minor (n=93)					
English	1	2	2	3	0
History	3	2	2	4	2
Social Studies	4	3	1	0	2
Other	4	37	6	13	8

Table 54

Number of Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction Courses Taken

Frequency	1	1.5	2	3	4	4.5	5.0	6	7	8	9	10	15	Miss.
Percentage	28	2	19	16	12	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	18

Table 55

Years of Professional Development Related to Social Studies

Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	14	15	Missing Responses
Frequency	21	18	15	5	1	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	34
Relative Percentage	20	17	14	5	1	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	32
Percentage Adjusted for n=73	29	25	21	7	1	7	4	1	1	1	1	1	

Table 56

Years of Professional Involvement Related to Social Studies

Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	14	15	Missing Responses
Frequency	10	15	16	5	3	3	1	1	1	52
Relative Percentage	9	14	15	5	3	3	1	1	1	49
Percentage Adjusted for n=55	18	27	29	9	6	6	2	2	2	

Table 57

Perceptions of Why Chosen as a Resource Teacher

Perception (n = 107)	Zone					Sample Total
	1	2&3	4	5	6	
Past Experience	12	27	14	20	11	84
Interest in Social Studies new curriculum/in-service project	5	13	5	8	3	34
Personal Skills	0	20	2	5	4	31
Educational Background	4	6	2	2	3	17
Recommended, supported or asked by others	2	9	2	2	2	17
Teaching competency	0	4	4	4	3	15
Little or no competition	10	2	0	1	2	14
Knowledge of Social Studies curriculum and/or resources	0	2	0	3	1	6
Professional Image	1	2	1	1	0	5
I Applied	5	0	0	0	0	5
I Teach a lot of Social Studies	1	1	3	0	0	5
Know many teachers in the county	0	0	1	2	1	4

Table 58

Resource Teacher Reasons for Accepting Position

Reasons (n = 107)	Frequency of Report
Change of pace (need for a change)	42
Challenge - exciting	38
Learning opportunities (in-depth knowledge and understanding of Social Studies curriculum	34
Desire and competence to help implementation of Social Studies curriculum	26
Opportunity to meet, work and learn from other teachers	26
Interest in Social Studies and new curriculum	25
Personal and professional growth	24
Unique experience	18
Potential for career and/or advancement	14
Like and/or committment to new curriculum	14
Need for In-Service	12
To be involved in project	7
To improve own teaching	7
Pressure and/or support from others	6
To provide leadership in implementation after project	3
Obliged to accept	3
Professional pride	2

APPENDIX B

Tables 59 to 74

Results of Content Analysis

(a) Resource Teacher Questionnaire
(b) Resource Teacher Interview
(c) Log Books
(d) Stakeholder Questionnaire
(e) Stakeholder Interview

(a) Resource Teacher Questionnaire

Table 59

Positive Aspects of In-Service Project

Aspects (n = 85)	Zone					Total Number (n=231)	Total Sample Percentage
	1	2&3	4	5	6		
Teacher interaction and sharing of ideas, teaching strategies, in-service materials, problems.	7	24	5	11	5	52	22
Increased teacher awareness, understanding, knowledge of and familiarization with 1981 Social Studies Curriculum.	8	18	5	3	7	41	17
Awareness of and familiarlization with resource materials and their use.	3	19	3	4	6	35	15
Peer-based consulting.	0	12	5	5	2	24	10
Focus and interest in Social Studies created.	0	11	0	0	1	12	5
Assistance to individual teachers.	3	5	0	1	2	11	4
Teacher release time for in-service.	0	5	1	4	1	11	4
Practical approach.	1	7	0	1	2	11	4
Increase of teacher confidence in teaching 1981 Social Studies Curriculum.	0	5	0	5	0	10	3
Alberta Education response (province-wide) basies to a need.	1	2	1	4	0	8	3
In-service by grade level.	0	0	1	0	5	6	2
Dissemination of resource materials.	1	3	1	0	0	5	2
Improved communcation among Social Studies teachers.	0	4	0	0	1	5	2

Table 60

Negative Aspects of In-Service Project

Aspects (n = 85)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Total Number (n=136)	Total Sample Percentage
Insufficient time (Project).	3	23	4	8	6	44	32
Inadequate training of resource teachers.	0	13	1	1	1	16	11
No follow-up to Social Studies In-service Project.	0	10	2	0	2	14	10
Mentor too theoretical.	0	9	0	2	3	14	10
Not all resource materials available when needed.	2	4	1	3	1	11	8
Inadequate lead-time.	1	8	0	0	1	10	7
Insufficient preparation time for resource teachers.	1	4	0	2	1	8	5
Difficult to In-service Grades 1-12 or In-service and teach part-time.	1	5	0	1	1	7	5
Inadequate role description and guidelines for resource teachers.	0	4	0	1	1	6	4
Lack of contact with other resource teachers	1	3	0	0	2	6	4

Table 61

Suggested Changes for the In-Service Project

Changes (n = 85)	Zone					Total Number (n=125)	Total Sample Percentage
	1	2&3	4	5	6		
More and better training of resource teachers.	1	22	0	3	5	31	24
Extension of In-Service Project.	2	15	2	5	1	25	20
Resource material available before In-Service starts.	5	3	0	2	2	12	9
Continuation of In-Service and updating for teachers.	1	8	1	0	0	10	8
More lead time.	0	5	2	1	1	9	7
Better role description and guidelines for resource teachers.	0	3	0	3	2	8	6
More classroom teacher consultation.	0	5	1	0	1	7	5
More contact and sharing with other resource teachers.	0	4	0	0	3	7	5
More demonstration lessons at each grade level.	0	5	0	1	0	6	4
Establish resource teams.	0	1	2	1	1	5	3
More preparation time for teachers.	1	2	0	0	2	5	3

Table 62

Personal Benefits Resulting from In-Service Project

Benefits (n = 85)	Zone 1	2&3	4	5	6	Total Number (n=252)	Total Sample Percentage
Opportunity to meet, interact with, work with, and learn from other professionals in Educational system.	7	39	2	16	9	73	28
Increased knowledge and understanding of Social Studies curriculum and instruction.	10	27	6	6	13	62	24
Increased personal skills and growth.	1	19	7	4	7	35	13
Professional growth.	0	12	3	4	2	21	8
Improved teaching skills.	0	9	1	2	0	12	4
Status and potential for career advancement.	0	8	1	3	0	12	4
Change of pace from teaching.	1	6	0	1	1	9	3
Awareness of and sensitivity of teacher concerns.	1	5	0	0	0	6	2
Renewed respect for people in teaching profession.	0	6	3	1	2	6	2
Opportunity to assist other teachers.	0	3	0	1	1	5	1

Table 63

Personal Losses Resulting from In-Service Project

Losses (n = 85)	Zone					Total Number (n=82)	Total Sample Percentage
	1	2&3	4	5	6		
1. Time (working long hours).	3	5	4	2	7	21	25
2. Lost contact with pupils, own school.	4	9	1	1	3	18	21
3. Uncompensated costs.	3	8	1	2	2	16	19
4. Disadvantages (to teachers and students) when take over class again.	0	6	1	0	3	10	12
5. Loss or fear of loss regarding re-assignment after term as resource teacher ends.	0	4	1	0	2	7	8
6. Frustration with dual role as teacher and resource teacher.	0	2	1	1	0	5	6
7. Sleep	0	1	0	1	3	5	6

(b) Resource Teacher Interviews

Table 64

Responses to Questions 1 and 2

Question	Frequency of Responses						
	Positive Number	Positive Percentage	Negative Number	Negative Percentage	Neutral Number	Neutral Percentage	Total Sample Number
1. General Opinion	84	74	14	12	15	13	113
2. Effects on you	72	79	11	12	8	8	91

Table 65

Responses to Question 2

Category (n = 30)	Total Sample Number (n=91)	Total Sample Percentage
1. Personal growth	13	14
2. Interesting and enjoyable experiences - meeting new people - working with other teachers - interacting with colleagues - observing teaching techniques and strategies	13	14
3. Professional growth	10	10
4. Gaining expertise in the Social Studies area	8	8
5. A learning experience	5	5
6. Exhaustion and stress	4	4
7. Less stress than teaching	4	4
8. Gaining a better understanding of the administrative process	3	3

Table 65 (continued)

Responses to Question 2

Category (n = 30)	Total Sample Number (n=91)	Total Sample Percentage
9. A sense of accomplishment, success, gratification	3	3
10. Potential for career advancement	3	3
11. Financial loss	2	2
12. Other	23	25

Table 66

"High Points" of Resource Teachers Involvement

Category (n = 30)	Total Sample Number (n=111)	Total Sample Percentage
1. Opportunity to meet and/or work with so many people in the educational system.	21	18
2. Support, assistance and recognition from regional consultants, teachers, boards, Alberta Education.	16	14
3. Workshops and demonstration lessons.	13	11
4. A break from the classroom.	12	10
5. Collegial relationships with other resource teachers.	9	8
6. Contact sessions with individual teachers.	8	7
7. Personal and professional growth.	6	5
8. Overview and understanding of the whole Social Studies program (grade 1 to 12).	6	5
9. Rewards, gratification from achievement of objectives.	6	5
10. Increased confidence and competency in my own teaching.	5	4
11. Other	9	8

Table 67

Problems

Category (n = 30)		Total Sample Number (n=50)	Total Sample Percentage
1.	Time - deadlines unrealistic, not enough lead-time, for individual teacher consultation.	12	24
2.	Passive resistance of some teachers and negative attitudes of administrators.	7	14
3.	Piloting Kanata Kits and developing teacher units.	5	10
4.	Training of resource teachers, lack of role description, rushed preparation.	4	8
5.	Organization and scheduling.	3	6
6.	Travel.	3	6
7.	Classroom contact sessions, access, no requests.	3	6
8.	Modification of Mentor Series.	3	6
9.	Shortage of references and resource material.	2	4
10.	Clerical assistance not specified.	2	4
11.	Job is not finished.	2	4
12.	Readjustment to classroom teaching.	2	4
13.	Long workdays.	2	4

Table 68

Changes

Category (n = 30)	Total Sample Number (n=52)	Total Sample Percentage
1. Time - increase the length of the Social Studies In-Service Project - increase the lead time - hold introductory workshops earlier - hold workshops through the year - hold resource teacher sessions earlier - hold resource teacher in-service in August or June - do not hold workshops in September	13	25
2. Resource teacher - need for clearer job description - need for increased training - more coordination of resource teachers at grade level, zone, level, provincial level - better screening of resource personnel - not have a resource teacher responsible for all grade levels	13	25
3. Resource materials - critical to have an adequate supply - critical to have available before start of project - resource teachers must have all appropriate materials - need centralization of all required materials - funding of addition resource material required - involve the publishers from the beginning	10	19
4. Approach - should be more practical - provide teaching strategies for each module, division (Mentor) - teaching strategies must be effective - provide student work samples on slides or video	4	7
5. Contact Sessions - should be 1 to 1 instead of groups - require the use of substitute teachers in multi-grade classes - should be put in resource teacher job description	3	5

Table 68 (continued)

Changes

Category (n = 30)	Total Sample Number (n=52)	Total Sample Percentage
6. Financial compensation to resource teachers - for increased costs due to geographical factors - for additional costs not covered by the budget	3	5
7. Provision for clerical, secretarial help required by resource teachers	2	3
8. Scheduling - should be done by research teachers and tailored to local needs - should be more realistic in view of distance and travel	2	3
9. Provision for follow-up activities (individual and group)	2	3

(c) Log Books

Table 69

Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books

Activities (by month)	Comments	
	Positive	Negative
SEPTEMBER		
Resource material lists; Guest speakers' list; Contact sessions; Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Orientation Sessions; Classroom Visitation; Demonstration Lessons; Follow-up on teacher requests; Presentation; Office/ Paper work; Gather and Distribute Materials; Design Book Inventory Form; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Needs Assessment.	French teachers pleased with workshop and would like another. Teachers had many positive comments. Administrators seem to have questions A Valuable week of in-service training.	Grade 1 teachers need an integrated program (S.S. and basic reading skills) Concern re lack of materials at this grade level (1-3).
OCTOBER		
Contact Sessions; Needs Assessment; Preparation; Workshops; Displays (Materials); Classroom Visitation; Demonstration Lessons; Classroom Observation; Follow-up on teacher request; Office/Paper work; Xerox and distribute ideas from previous workshop; Social Studies Conference; 1-1 Consultation with teachers; Prepare Resource Inventory; Typing; Idea Pool.	Most comments about Mentor were good. Senior high teachers liked 'ideas list' Modified peer-based activities questionnaire is working fairly well.	Teachers concerned that we even presume to evaluate values (gr.8). Concern re testing (gr.3) Concern re Inquiry Process for low ability students.

Table 69 (continued)

Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books

Activities (by month)	Comments	
	Positive	Negative
NOVEMBER		
Contact Sessions; Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Classroom Visitation; Demonstration Lessons; Follow-up on Teacher Requests; Presentations; Distribution and Collection of Teaching Questionnaires; Office/ Paper Work; Classroom Observation; Collect and Distribute Materials; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers Start Resource Survey; Library Survey; Newsletter for Schools; Typing & Xerox.	Teachers pleased to get "Books for Youth" guides Most informative contact session. Teachers glad to get "ideas" package from other resource teachers.	Concern re new Curriculum in multi-grade classes. Concern re lack of resource materials. No set policy re - purchase of prescribed resources. Teacher questionnaire arrived too late.
DECEMBER		
Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Regular Classroom Visitation; Lesson Observation; Follow-up on Teacher Requests; Follow-up Visit to Schools; Visit Regional/County Office; Presentations; Office/ Paper Work; xerox and Deliver Materials; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Resource Survey; Book Orders; Community Directory	Interest in planning checklists for evaluation of research skills. Presentation to School Boards re purpose of In-Service Project and the state of S.S. seemed to be well received. Expression of appreciation from teachers.	The amount of xeroxing is as full-time job! French immersion concern about resource materials. Negative teacher comments about teacher questionnaire.

Table 69 (continued)

Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books

Activities (by month)	Comments	
	Positive	Negative
JANUARY		
Contact Sessions; Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Classroom Visitation; Visit Regional/County Office; Follow-up on Teacher Requests; Follow-up on School Visits; Compile and Distribute Materials; Presentations; Office/Paper Work; Completion of Resource Survey; Compile Suggestion Page; Booklet of Ideas for Teachers; Assist IMC re Purchasing Materials; Demonstration Lessons; Assist in Preparation of Social Studies Policy.	Teachers glad to receive new teaching units. Teachers pleased to receive electives guide. Teaching unit 9B well received (comments indicating it is one of the best.	Concern re adequate resource materials (choice and funding) Teacher concern re achievement specs.(gr.6) Concern re adapting materials to meet special student needs.
FEBRUARY		
Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Classroom Visitation; Collect and Distribute Materials; Office/Paperwork; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Attend lecture at U. of A.; Handouts of Values Model Chart (with examples for use at each grade level).	Increased teacher confidence in teaching the 1981 S.S. Curriculum. Super to have time to develop and revise T.U. for Junior High S.S.	

Table 69 (continued)

Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books

Activities (by month)	Comments	
	Positive	Negative
MARCH		
Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Classroom Visitations; Collect and Distribute Materials; Office/Paperwork; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Needs Assessment; Prepare Newsletter; Education Week Activities.		
APRIL		
Preparation; Workshops; Meetings; Classroom Visitation; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Distribute New Teaching Units; Office/Paperwork; Assist in Purchase Orders for Resource Materials.	Teachers very positive toward a "prep-period" in-Service rather than being in the classroom	Had to adapt Mentor (Resolving the Issue) to make it practical for the teacher. Fear of the future of the S.S. Curriculum if no continuing follow-up.
MAY		
Contact Sessions; Preparation; Workshops; Classroom Visitations; 1-1 Consulting with Teachers; Analysis of Teacher In-Service Evaluations; Developed "Planning for Next Year" Format; Office/Paperwork; Distribute Materials.	Teacher evaluations of in-service reinforced that it was a success. All teachers considered the new teaching units far superior to the original units.	Shortage of resource material. Such a volume of possible materials that it requires much scrutiny due to time limitations.

Table 69 (continued)

Content Analysis of a Sample of Teacher Log Books

Activities (by month)	Comments	
	Positive	Negative
JUNE		
Preparation; Workshops; Final Follow-up on Teacher Requests; Final Sorting of Materials (return/reclaim); Resource Material Inventory; Collect Materials for Unit Construction; Distribute Newsletter; Office/Paperwork; 1-1 Consultation with Teachers; Meetings; Assist with Purchase Orders for Resource Materials; Make Resource Lists.		

(d) Stakeholder Questionnaire

Table 70

Positive Side Effects

Responses (n = 97)	Frequency (n = 209)	Percentage of Total Sample
1. Greater awareness of and familiarity with the 1981 Social Studies curriculum and resource materials by all teachers of Social Studies on a province wide basis.	50	23
2. Increased awareness, knowledge and understanding of the objectives and content of the Social Studies program.	19	9
3. Greater variation in teaching techniques and strategies.	16	7
4. The exchange and sharing of ideas and materials among teachers.	15	7
5. Effective peer-based consultation and leadership.	12	5
6. Good presentation and overview of the total Social Studies curriculum from grade 1 to 12.	11	5
7. Meeting the needs of individual teachers (and new teachers) in implementing the 1981 Social Studies curriculum.	10	4
8. Renewed interest in Social Studies and in the teaching of Social Studies.	9	4
9. Excellent local resource personnel available after the In-service Project.	7	3
10. Appreciation (by teachers) of assistance from Alberta Education in implementing the Social Studies curriculum and (by boards) of funding provided by Alberta Education for in-service project.	7	3
11. Fuller understanding of the Inquiry Process.	7	3
12. Higher level of teacher confidence in teaching the Social Studies program.	7	3
13. Increased teacher planning and competency in the teaching of Social Studies.	7	3

Table 70 (continued)

Positive Side Effects

Responses (n = 97)		Frequency (n = 209)	Percentage of Total Sample
14.	Professional growth of the resource personnel.	6	2
15.	Increased communication (and rapport) among Social Studies teachers within the school, jurisdiction and educational system.	5	2
16.	Upgrading of Social Studies resources in schools.	5	2
17.	Continuous updating of new resources available and of sources of assistance.	5	2
18.	More positive teacher attitudes towards the Social Studies program.	5	2
19.	Improved quality of instruction.	3	1
20.	Availability of resource people.	3	1

Table 71

Negative Side Effects

Responses (n = 97)		Frequency (n = 102)	Percentage of Total Sample
1.	Disruption of class learning.	15	14
2.	Extra cost for boards.	15	14
3.	Creation of in-service expectations for the future that will be difficult to match.	9	8
4.	The Inquiry Process is unrealistic-emphasized too much - not adequately covered in the curriculum.	8	7

Table 71 (continued)

Negative Side Effects

Responses (n = 97)		Frequency (n = 102)	Percentage of Total Sample
5.	Confusion and frustration of teachers, bombardment by content, materials, etc. in too short a time.	6	5
6.	Inadequate supply and/or late arrival of resource materials.	6	5
7.	Repetitious sessions (ie. where in-service, before the project started, was locally sponsored).	5	4
8.	Insufficient time for in-servicing of teachers.	5	4
9.	The public resented missed instructional days and/or added substitutes.	4	3
10.	Some poorly prepared resource personnel.	4	3
11.	Problems in getting substitute teachers.	4	3
12.	The local Social Studies Curriculum Committee was ignored.	3	2
13.	Inconvenient time-line.	3	2
14.	Mandatory attendance at workshops.	3	2
15.	Teachers not enthused about attending the sessions.	2	1
16.	Sessions and/or materials did not meet the needs of the French bilingual program.	2	1
17.	Too general.	2	1
18.	No follow-up.	2	1
19.	Not enough practical help.	2	1
20.	Emphasized professional development not a personal responsibility	2	1
21.	High school teachers less positive.	2	1

Table 72

Suggested Changes

Responses (n = 97)	Frequency (n = 121)	Percentage of Total Sample
1. Timing to in-service sessions, workshops. - in the evening (for credit) (1) - professional exchange seminar (non credit) (1) - on-going in-servicing (2) - use professional development days not personal time (1) - hold during conventions (1) - Hold on non-teaching days (4) - hold outside regular school year (8) - establish provincial professional development days during which special councils meet for in-service (1) - pre-inservice by the university in summer workshops (1)	22	18
2. Emphasis and content of in-service sessions. - more specific and less overview (1) - concrete explanations of the Inquiry Process/Unit (6) - keep approach practical (7) - more time on sharing ideas (2) - deal with more teaching strategies (2) - wore out Kanata Kit from beginning to end (1) - help with time management (re projects) (1) - stress other approaches besides inquiry (1)	21	17
3. Extend the in-service project. - appoint resource teachers for 2 years - hold more than 2 workshops - to all subjects	18	14
4. More lead-time to plan and organize.	17	14
5. More small groups and fewer large group sessions.	7	5
6. Additional funding to offset costs of substitute teachers, resource materials, additional costs.	7	5
7. Coordinate in-service project with local curriculum committees.	4	3
8. In-service by individual grade level.	4	3

Table 72 (continued)

Suggested Changes

Responses (n = 97)	Frequency (n = 121)	Percentage of Total Sample
9. Ensure all resource materials are available prior to in-service.	4	3
10. Meet individual teacher needs through contact sessions.	3	2
11. Eliminate mandatory aspects of in-service.	2	1
12. Directions and structure for continuation and follow-up.	2	1
13. Allow for choice of implementation model.	2	1
14. Provide special in-service for administrators to deal with administrative problems as in-service project is now designed.	1	1
15. Meet special needs (eg. Bilingual Education).	1	1
16. More extensive needs assessment	1	1
17. Resource teachers should have credibility	1	1
18. Future validations of resource material.	1	1
19. Increase the number of resource teachers to provide for more individual follow-up at workshops.	1	1
20. Drop the external evaluation component.	1	1

(e) Stakeholder Interviews

Table 73

Stakeholder Interviews

Responses	Category	Frequency (n = 89)	Percentage of Total Sample
A. Positive	1. Positive contribution to the In-Service Project by resource teachers	17	19
	2. Value of the Inservice Project	12	13
	3. Benefits to teachers	12	13
	4. Positive attitudes and reactions to the In-Service Project	8	8
	5. Resource Materials	4	4
B. Negative	1. Time factors	6	6
	2. Resource Materials	5	5
	3. Content of S.S. Curriculum	3	3
	4. Use of professional development days for In-Service	3	3
	5. Mandatory aspect	2	2
	6. Individual and schools needs	2	2
	7. Other	5	5
C. Neutral Comments		4	4

Table 74

Stakeholder Interviews - Suggested Changes

Responses Category	Frequency (n = 31)	Percentage of Total Sample
1. Time factors	6	19
2. Resource teachers	6	19
3. Workshops	5	16
4. Resource Materials	2	6
5. Make in-service optional	2	6
6. Do not use professional development days for subject area in-service	2	6
7. Involvement of local personnel in scheduling	2	6
8. Other	6	19